This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY
AH 4HX9 4

Church Text Books

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

The Church: its Ministry and Authority

DARWELL STONE

702
S877ch
1908

HIERONYMUS
ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

Oxford Church Text Books

The Church:

its Ministry and Authority

BY

THE REV. DARWELL STONE, M.A.

LIBRARIAN OF PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD

FORMERLY PRINCIPAL OF DORCHESTER MISSIONARY COLLEGE

THIRD EDITION

NEW YORK

EDWIN S. GORHAM

CHURCH MISSIONS HOUSE, FOURTH AVENUE, AND 22ND STREET

1908

702
S897ch
1908

PREFACE

THIS book is an attempt to state in a short and clear form the facts and doctrine with regard to the Church contained in Holy Scripture and later history. The scope of it forbids any extensive citing of authorities; a few references are given in the hope that they may supply a help to further study on the part of those who have opportunity.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Anticipations of the Church before the teaching of Christ,	1
II.	The Church in the Gospels,	6
III.	The Church in the Acts of the Apostles,	17
IV.	The Church in the Epistles and the Revelation,	23
V.	The Church in History later than the New Testament: A visible society,	37
VI.	The Church in History later than the New Testament: Unity,	44
VII.	The Church in History later than the New Testament: Holiness,	56
VIII.	The Church in History later than the New Testament: Catholicity,	58
IX.	The Church in History later than the New Testament: Apostolicity,	60
X.	Priesthood in natural religion and in the nation of Israel,	65
XI.	The High Priesthood of Christ and the priestly character of the Christian Church,	69
XII.	The Apostles and the Church,	76
XIII.	The Ministry in the New Testament,	81
XIV.	The Ministry in History later than the New Testament,	91
XV.	The Authority of the Church as shown in the New Testament,	112
XVI.	The Authority of the Church in History later than the New Testament,	115
INDEX,		123

THE CHURCH: ITS MINISTRY AND AUTHORITY

CHAPTER I

ANTICIPATIONS OF THE CHURCH BEFORE THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

Introductory.—The description of the Church contained in the New Testament is one of surpassing grandeur. It is there represented as the kingdom and family and household of God the Father, as the body of God the Son made Man, and as the temple and home of God the Holy Ghost. It would have been altogether contrary to the general method of the divine working in nature and in grace if so splendid and so overwhelming an idea had been given to the world without any work of preparation or without fitting surroundings in which it might live and from which it might extend. And, as a matter of fact, the preparation had lasted for many centuries; and it was amid surroundings in which this had been most fully carried out that the Church was proclaimed and began to be.

The Preaching of S. John the Baptist.—As S. John the Baptist was the herald and forerunner of the teaching and work of our Lord generally, so also was he of the Church in particular. It was part of his office to foretell and proclaim the coming of the Saviour who as the Lamb of God should redeem mankind (Luke iii. 6; John i. 36). It was another part of it to preach and to administer that baptism of repentance which supplied the final stage in the preparation for the institution of the Christian Sacrament of Baptism (Matt. iii. 6, 11;

Mark i. 4, 5, 8; Luke iii. 3, 7, 16; John i. 33). Besides this proclamation of the atoning work which was to give meaning to the existence of the Church and this preparation for the Sacrament which was to form the means of admission to it and the power which should unite its members to one another and to God, S. John the Baptist declared the coming of the kingdom of heaven. 'In those days,' says S. Matthew, 'cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Matt. iii. 1, 2). He described Him of whom he was the forerunner as a King for whom, as for an Eastern monarch, the way must be prepared. 'For this is that which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make ye ready the way of the Lord, make His paths straight' (Matt. iii. 3). He depicted this King as carrying out a work of justice, as One 'whose fan is in His hand, and He will throughly cleanse His threshing-floor; and He will gather His wheat into the garner, but the chaff He will burn up with unquenchable fire' (Matt. iii. 12). And it is to be noticed that, when our Lord joined the beginning of His own ministry to the close of that of S. John the Baptist, it was in the preaching about the kingdom that He made the link. 'From that time,' says S. Matthew, 'began Jesus to preach, and to say, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Matt. iv. 17). 'After that John was delivered up,' says S. Mark, 'Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel' (Mark i. 14, 15).

Jewish Anticipations in the Old Testament.—The idea of a divine kingdom was not new when S. John the Baptist began to preach. The conception of the world which the Old Testament suggests is that of a kingdom under the rule of God. The purpose of creation was that God might receive the service of created beings, and that in this service they might themselves attain their highest good. When the fulfilment of the purpose was for the time interrupted by the introduction of sin in the Fall, and by the subsequent growth of wickedness, the idea

of a moral kingdom was preserved by the promise of redemption. The call of Abraham and the choice of the nation of Israel eventually led to the establishment of an earthly kingdom. This kingdom throughout had a typical significance. The ideal of the ruler was of one who was the instrument and representative of God, whose rule was based on divine ordinances and guided by the divine will, of whom it could be said that God was his Father (2 Sam. vii. 14). As the revelation contained in the Old Testament was gradually developed, the character of the future kingdom, of which the earthly Jewish kingdom was the type, was more clearly shown. It had been foretold to Abraham that the blessing granted to him and to his seed should extend to all mankind (Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18), and that kings should be among his descendants (Gen. xvii. 6). As the picture of the future kingdom grows in fulness, it is seen that a deliverer and ruler, the descendant of Abraham and David, who, in addition to being the servant of the Lord, will also Himself be of superhuman character and authority, is to rule over Gentiles as well as Jews. The 'kingdom of priests,' which the 'holy nation' of Israel formed (Ex. xix. 6), was a prophetical type of a spiritual kingdom which should be world-wide and include all nations; and the ideal king, the characteristics of whom were found only imperfectly in the best Jewish kings, was an anticipation of the spiritual monarch who should be both the deliverer from sin and the ruler of those whom He had redeemed. Thus, the failure of the Jewish kings and people to attain to the high ideal set before them gave emphasis to the anticipations of psalmists and prophets that there should be a kingdom of righteousness in which the divine purpose should be fulfilled and which should last for ever (*e.g.* Ps. lxxii.; Dan. vii. 13; Zech. vi. 13).[1]

Later Jewish Anticipations: The 'Psalms of Solomon.'—There are many indications that this idea of a divine kingdom had not been lost among the Jews at the time

[1] Cf. Liddon, *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, pp. 80-91; Church, *Advent Sermons*, pp. 29-57.

of the birth of our Lord. The book known as the *Psalms of Solomon* was probably written about the middle of the first century before Christ. It has been supposed to have been intended by devout Pharisees as a means of protesting against the corruptions in Jewish thought and life which were due to the influences of the Asmonæan dynasty which had ruled in Palestine from B.C. 153 to B.C. 37 before the reign of Herod the Great. However this may have been, it is in the highest degree probable that this book represents beliefs and aspirations current at the time when it was written. To a large extent it contains reproductions of the language and thought of the Old Testament; and among these, some prominence is given to the idea of the future kingdom in which the Messiah was to bear rule. Thus, in the seventeenth of these *Psalms*, after the writer has described with great force the sad state of decay into which the Jewish nation has fallen, so that 'the king was a transgressor, and the judge was disobedient, and the people sinful' (xvii. 22), he appeals to God to raise up the 'king,' 'the son of David,' 'the Lord Messiah,' that He may reign in righteousness over a people which He has brought back to the true service of God (xvii. 23-46). And, while appeal is thus made for the rule of the king Messiah, the Lord God is recognised as the eternal king of the nation and as One whose kingdom is everlasting (xvii. 1, 51). Here, then, is the same conception as that presented in the Old Testament—the conception of an ideal kingdom set up on earth, administered by the son of David, the anointed of the Lord, realising the perfection which the pre-exilic kingdom failed to reach, and in which the Messianic king bears rule on behalf of God Himself.

Later Jewish Anticipations: The Targums.—The evidence supplied by the Targums or Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament is much the same as that afforded by the *Psalms of Solomon*. The Targums, as we know them, appear to be much later than the time of the birth of our Lord. They probably reached their present form between the first and the fourth centuries of the Christian era. But it is probable that they contain very much which in substance or in phraseology existed in

pre-Christian times; and it is unlikely that the references to the royalty of the Messiah, and to the kingdom in which he was to bear rule, were added after the first preaching of Christianity. If these references are taken as indicative of the beliefs and anticipations of the orthodox Jews before the coming of Christ, it is clear that it was expected that one part of the work of the Messiah would be to establish a kingdom. 'The king Messiah' is a phrase which frequently occurs; and though the words 'kingdom of heaven' or 'kingdom of God' usually denote the rule of God as eventually perfected, there are instances in which they are used to describe the days and work of the Messiah. The words of Isaiah (xl. 9), 'Behold your God,' are paraphrased 'The kingdom of your God is revealed.' In the description of the 'Servant of the Lord' in the same prophet, it is said 'They shall see the kingdom of their Messiah' (Isa. liii. 10). The prophecy of Micah (iv. 7) that 'the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion' is rendered 'The kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed to them on Mount Zion.'

Signs of Jewish Anticipations in the New Testament.—So too, in the New Testament, S. Joseph of Arimathæa is described by S. Mark (xv. 43) and S. Luke (xxiii. 51) as one who was 'looking for the kingdom of God,' a phrase which appears to be equivalent to the description of those who were looking forward to the coming of the Messiah as 'looking for the consolation of Israel' (Luke ii. 25), or for 'redemption' (Luke ii. 38).

Conclusion.—Thus, there is good reason for thinking that, when S. John the Baptist proclaimed the coming in the near future of the 'kingdom of heaven,' that phrase would suggest to the minds of at any rate some of his hearers the approach of the Messiah in the accomplishment of whose work was to be the fulfilment of the hope of the Jewish race.[1]

[1] Since this book was written Dr. Robertson's *Regnum Dei* (Bampton Lectures for 1901) has been published. The present writer cannot agree with some details in it; but it contains very much of great value on the subject of this chapter, and on subjects treated of in other parts of this book.

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH IN THE GOSPELS

Introductory.—It has already been seen that one of the anticipations of the work of the Messiah in Jewish thought was that He would establish a divine kingdom, and that the point of contact between the preaching of S. John the Baptist and the work of previous Jewish teachers, including the writers of the Old Testament, was that he proclaimed the approach of Him of whom he was the forerunner as the coming of the 'kingdom of heaven.' It has, further, been pointed out that the connection between the conclusion of the ministry of S. John the Baptist and the beginning of that of our Lord was in the proclamation of the 'kingdom of heaven' which was common to both. When our Lord's work had begun, to 'preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God' was His own description of the fulfilment of the purpose for which He was sent (Luke iv. 43; cf. viii. 1). On the sending out of the apostles, the proclamation they were directed to make was 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Matt. x. 7); and an object of the call of another was that he might 'publish abroad the kingdom of God' (Luke ix. 60).

The Phrases 'Kingdom of Heaven' and 'Kingdom of God.'—What is variously called the 'kingdom of heaven' or the 'kingdom of God' fills a very prominent place in the words of Christ. In S. Matthew's Gospel, except in four passages (xii. 28, xix. 24, xxi. 31, 43),[1] the phrase 'kingdom of heaven' is used. In those four passages, and in the rest of the New Testament, the expression

[1] According to the received text, there is a fifth passage, namely vi. 33.

is the 'kingdom of God.' It is not likely that any difference in meaning was intended. The kingdom of God is the kingdom of the Father; and the Father is to be addressed with the words 'Who art in heaven' (Matt. vi. 9, 10; Luke xi. 2). The rule that is divine is associated with all those qualities and aims which are suggested by the word heavenly. S. Matthew probably preserves an exact translation into Greek of the Aramaic phrase to denote the rule of God which our Lord actually used, while the other writers give, not a verbal transcription, but the corresponding equivalent as it was natural to express it in Greek. The exceptional instances in S. Matthew's Gospel have led some competent scholars to think that both phrases were used by our Lord Himself.

Spiritual Character of the 'Kingdom of Heaven.'—At the outset of His ministry, our Lord declared the spiritual conditions of repentance and faith which were necessary for those who were to commit themselves to His rule. When He 'came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of God,' after the imprisonment of S. John the Baptist had begun, the message which He proclaimed was, 'The kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel' (Mark i. 15). At a later time He showed vividly the need of humility. When the disciples, in the perplexity which appears to have arisen as their old ideas of the office of the Messiah were being gradually seen to be in conflict with much which the Lord taught, asked Him, 'Who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' as His answer, 'He called to Him a little child, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. xviii. 1-4; cf. xix. 14). When He was explaining to His disciples 'the mysteries of the kingdom of God,' He showed that 'an honest and good heart,' perseverance and 'patience,' were needful if there was to be success under His rule (Luke viii. 10, 15). In the Sermon on the Mount, the seeking of the

'kingdom' of the Father and the seeking of 'righteousness' were closely connected (Matt. vi. 33, R.V.). Entrance into the kingdom was promised, not to 'every one that saith,' 'Lord, Lord,' but to him 'that doeth the will of' the 'Father which is in heaven' (Matt. vii. 21). To enter it was declared impossible for those whose 'righteousness' did not exceed that 'of the scribes and Pharisees' (Matt. v. 20), and a difficult task, only to be accomplished by the use of the all-powerful grace of God, for a rich man (Matt. xix. 23-26). The breaking of, and the leading others to break, even the 'least commandments,' would make little those who were in the kingdom, while performance and teaching of them were means to greatness in it (Matt. v. 19). To recognise the claims of God and of fellow-men on human love was to be 'not far from the kingdom of God' (Mark xii. 34). The characteristics of the citizens of the kingdom were described in terms which showed that they must be actuated by principles which affected the innermost springs of life, since they were to be 'poor in spirit,' to 'mourn,' to be 'meek,' to 'hunger and thirst after righteousness,' to be 'merciful,' to be 'pure in heart,' to be 'peacemakers,' to be willing to be 'persecuted for righteousness' sake' (Matt. v. 3-10). Of the kingdom itself our Lord told the Pharisees that it 'cometh not with observation,' but 'is within' (Luke xvii. 20, 21).[1]

The 'Kingdom of Heaven' the Kingdom of Christ.—The Christian kingdom, being the 'kingdom of God,' is the kingdom of the Father (Matt. vi. 33, R.V., xiii. 43). But it is also the kingdom of our Lord Himself. His first proclamation of it called on men to 'believe in the gospel' (Mark i. 15). Since the full act of faith can only be directed towards a Person (cf. John xiv. 1), belief 'in the Gospel' must needs be a step towards belief and faith in Christ. It was the faith which the Gentile centurion showed in Him which led our Lord to declare the future coming in of many 'from the east

[1] Possibly, however, the words translated 'within you' in A.V. and R.V. may mean 'among you' (A.V. margin) or 'in the midst of you' (R.V. margin).

and the west' to 'sit down' 'in the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. viii. 10, 11). On more than one occasion He Himself described it as His kingdom (Matt. xiii. 41, xvi. 28; cf. xxv. 34; John xviii. 36). The archangel Gabriel foretold to the Virgin Mary of the Son whom she was to bear, 'The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever: and of His kingdom there shall be no end' (Luke i. 32, 33).

The 'Kingdom of Heaven' Outward as well as Inward.—The spiritual qualities of the citizens of the kingdom and their relation of faith and obedience to Christ its King do not exhaust the description of it in the Gospels. Besides these inward and invisible characteristics, there are also outward marks and organisation. The subjects of the kingdom are men. For entrance into it the Sacrament of Holy Baptism is required. Our Lord taught Nicodemus, 'Except any one be begotten anew' (or 'from above'), 'he cannot see the kingdom of God.' When Nicodemus was puzzled by the saying, He said further, 'Except any one be begotten of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God' (John iii. 3, 5). That the reference is to the Sacrament of Holy Baptism is shown by the teaching found elsewhere in the New Testament as to the means and nature of regeneration, the work of the Holy Ghost, and the effects of Baptism, and by the continuous tradition of the Christian Church.[1] The command to 'make disciples of all the nations,' which formed part of our Lord's last charge to His apostles before His ascension, could not, consistently with the whole tenour of the Gospels, be carried out without the admission of those thus referred to into the 'kingdom of heaven'; and it is there specified that the method by which the apostles are to 'make disciples' is by 'baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' (Matt. xxviii. 19). Moreover, that the 'kingdom of heaven' has an outward organisation is shown by the parables

[1] See the volume *Holy Baptism*, pp. 25, 228, 229, in the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.'

of the wheat and the tares, of the net cast into the sea, and of the man who had not a wedding garment. If it was inward only and existed only by reason of spiritual qualities in those belonging to it, these would be exclusively persons who, if human beings should be divided into two classes, would be reckoned with the good, and who were going in the direction of attaining to eternal salvation. But in these parables, our Lord has taught that there will be bad as well as good within the 'kingdom of heaven,' and that some who have been in it will be cast out into the 'furnace of fire' and the 'outer darkness.' 'The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man that sowed good seed in his field . . . the good seed, these are the sons of the kingdom; and the tares are the sons of the evil one. . . . The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth' (Matt. xiii. 24, 38, 41, 42). 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: which, when it was filled, they drew up on the beach; and they sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but the bad they cast away. So shall it be in the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth' (Matt. xiii. 47-50). 'The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a certain king, which made a marriage feast for his son. . . . When the king came in to behold the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment: and He said unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then the king said to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few chosen' (Matt. xxii. 2, 11-14).

The 'Kingdom of Heaven' Present as well as Future.—The 'kingdom of heaven,' in its perfected state, is viewed as future. In the parable of the wheat and the

tares, after 'all things that cause stumbling and' they 'that do iniquity' have been cast out, it is said, 'Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father' (Matt. xiii. 43). It is foretold of the time 'when the Son of man shall come in His glory' that there will then be an entrance by the righteous into the kingdom. 'Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world' (Matt. xxv. 34). In the Sermon on the Mount this entrance into the kingdom is similarly regarded as future; for with evident reference to 'that day,' that is the day of judgment, it is said, 'Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven' (Matt. vii. 21). It is apparently at the day of judgment also that those 'from the east and west, and from the north and south' 'shall come' and 'sit down in the kingdom of God' (Luke xiii. 29). The supposition that the 'kingdom of God was immediately to appear' at the time of our Lord's ministry was corrected as a mistake (Luke xix. 11). The signs of the coming of the end of the world were to be indications that 'the kingdom of God is nigh' (Luke xxi. 31). At the institution of the Holy Eucharist our Lord spoke of the kingdom as something which was to be after the dispensation of the present age. 'I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom,' or 'until the kingdom of God shall come' (Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 16, 18). On the same evening, He said to His disciples, apparently referring to the day of judgment, and the times which should follow it, 'I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as My Father appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Luke xxii. 29, 30; cf. Matt. xix. 28). The words 'kingdom of God' are used as equivalent to the 'life' which is eternal and as denoting the opposite state to 'hell' (Mark ix. 47; cf. 43, 45). But, while there is thus a future

aspect, the kingdom is distinctly represented as existing in the present. 'The kingdom of God is at hand' were our Lord's words in beginning His ministry (Mark i. 15). 'The kingdom of God' was to 'come with power' before some should 'taste of death' (Mark ix. 1; cf. Matt. xvi. 28; Luke ix. 27). The preaching of the apostles and of other disciples was a proclamation of the 'kingdom of God' as well as of the 'gospel' (Matt. x. 7; Luke ix. 2; cf. 60; x. 11). To follow Christ personally was to have access to the 'kingdom of God' (Luke ix. 62). Instruction concerning it was part of the work of our Lord's ministry (Luke ix. 11). That He 'by the Spirit of God cast out demons' was a sign that 'the kingdom of God' had 'come'[1] (Matt. xii. 28). The parables of the wheat and the tares and of the net cast into the sea, as they show the outward character of the kingdom, show also its existence in the present before the time when, at the day of judgment, the bad shall be separated from the good (Matt. xiii. 24-30, 37-43, 47-50). The 'kingdom of heaven' is spoken of by our Lord as existing during His ministry and as the dispensation which S. John the Baptist ushered in, though he did not himself reach it (Matt. xi. 11, 12).

The 'Kingdom of Heaven' a Gift from God.—The terms in which the kingdom is referred to show that it is not merely a human work, but that it is a divine gift. That it 'comes' or 'comes nigh'[2] (Matt. iii. 2, vi. 10, xii. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke xi. 2, 20, xvii. 20), and is 'given' (Matt. xxi. 43; Luke xii. 32), and is 'received' (Mark x. 15; Luke xviii. 17), and is 'inherited' by those for whom it has been 'prepared' (Matt. xxv. 34), and that men 'enter' it (Matt. v. 20, xix. 23; John iii. 5), and that it is an object of search (Matt. vi. 33, xiii. 45, 46; Luke xii. 31), and that it is a treasure hidden, found, and rightly bought at great cost and sacrifice (Matt. xiii. 44-46),—'all this means that it is not built up by the labour of man, it is not a product of development from below, but "of the creative activity of God."'[3] No less

[1] ἔφθασεν. [2] ἔρχεσθαι, ἐγγίζειν, φθάνειν.

[3] Sanday in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 620, quoting Lütgert, *Reich Gottes*, p. 26.

as it now exists than in its future perfection, the kingdom is His gift.

The 'Kingdom of Heaven' and the Church.—Like the phrase 'kingdom of heaven,' the Greek word usually translated 'Church'[1] was inherited from the Jews. In the Greek translation of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint it was used to denote the congregation of the people of Israel assembled or called together. It occurs twice in S. Matthew's Gospel. In the first passage our Lord says to S. Peter about the founding or building of the Church, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it' (Matt. xvi. 18). In the second passage, the authority of the Church thus founded is referred to. 'If he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church: and if he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican' (Matt. xviii. 17). In each case, the reference to the Church is closely connected with allusions to the 'kingdom of heaven.' In the former passage, our Lord, after speaking of the foundation of the Church, immediately goes on to say, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. xvi. 19). In the latter passage, our Lord's words about the action of the Church with regard to the sin of one Christian against another lead S. Peter to inquire, 'How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times?' and our Lord in His reply to this inquiry tells how 'the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a certain king' (Matt. xviii. 21, 23). From the first of these passages it may be rightly inferred that the outward and visible 'kingdom of God' of this present life is to be identified with the Church, which, also, when purified by the casting out of all persons and things that are evil, and perfected by the stablishing and completing of all that are good, will be the glorious 'kingdom of heaven' of the future.

The Nature of the Church as described in the Gospels.—It was a purpose of the life and ministry of our Lord that God might bestow on men the knowledge of His

[1] ἐκκλησία.

truth and the gifts of His grace. 'The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us' 'full of grace and truth.' 'Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ' (John i. 14, 17). That men might receive this knowledge and these gifts, it was necessary that they should be in that attitude of repentance and faith which the work of S. John the Baptist and the ministry of our Lord Himself were designed to produce (Mark i. 2-4, 15). But, as the Gospels are studied attentively, it becomes clear that preaching to and help of the multitudes occupied in our Lord's ministry a less important place than the training of the apostles; and that the selection and instruction and discipline of a chosen body of disciples was made to be a primary work. It was when they had been trained so that the declaration 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' had been made that the promise of the building of the Church could be given. 'When Jesus came into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying, Who do men say that the Son of man is? And they said, Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Matt. xvi. 13-19). 'The outburst of keenly perceptive faith had now at last shown S. Peter, carrying with him the rest, to have the prime qualification for the task which his Lord contemplated for him.'[1] That 'task' was to be the nucleus of the society which was to form the Christian Church. The special characteristics of our Lord's training of His

[1] Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 17.

apostles become intelligible when this is recognised. They are 'chosen' and 'appointed' (John xv. 16), given by the Father 'out of the world' (John xvii. 6), made to be 'not of the world' (John xvii. 16), pleaded for with a special prayer (John xvii. 9), promised the gift of 'the Comforter, even the Spirit of Truth,' 'the Holy Spirit' (John xiv. 16, 17, 26, xvi. 7-14), not simply for their own personal good, but also that they may 'bear witness' (John xv. 27) to the truth, and be the depositories of the grace (John xx. 22, 23) which Christ came to bring. In the training of the apostles, then, there was the forecast of the Christian Church as a visible society of men in which the truth and grace of God were to be found. That our Lord intended His Church to be such a visible society is shown, moreover, in the institution of the Sacraments. In appointing Baptism as the method of entrance into the Church (Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii. 5), and the Eucharist as the means of the communion of His people with His own human life (Matt. xxvi. 26-28), our Lord established outward marks by which His servants were to be known. The kingdom of heaven, again, in its outward aspect and its present life, was a visible society.[1] But this visible Church, the community of Christians, the assembly of those outwardly known by the badges of Christian fellowship, was to be the sphere in which the inner life of its members was to be developed on those lines of repentance and faith by which they could use the divine gifts to produce moral conformity with the pattern laid down by our Lord in His words and life and spiritual union between the souls of men and God Himself. The kingdom of heaven in its perfection is the kingdom which has yet to be manifested, the ideal which is not yet realised. The actual Church which now is makes progress towards that ideal as its members strive to attain the completeness of moral life which the Lord set forth (Matt. v. 48). They are subject to the law that every good thing which they received from God lays them under the obligation of in

[1] See Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, pp. 32-40 (fourth edition).

turn communicating good to their fellow-men (Matt. xviii. 23-35). The kingdom is a sphere of work into which they are summoned by the call of God (Matt. xx. 1-16). The rule of Christ in their souls is His kingdom within them, as the Church is His outward and visible kingdom. This rule in the soul, as the Church in the world, grows from small beginnings to great results, like the tree which springs from the 'grain of mustard-seed' (Matt. xiii. 31, 32), and is of powerful influence, like the 'leaven' 'hid in three measures of meal' (Matt. xiii. 33). It makes progress in mysterious ways known only to God (Mark iv. 26-29). It, also, like the Church again, is so precious that for it one who is wise 'goeth and selleth all that he hath' in order to buy it, as 'treasure hidden in the field' and 'one pearl of great price' (Matt. xiii. 44-46), and shrinks back from no sacrifice however painful for its sake (Matt. xix. 12; Luke xviii. 29). Great sinners who have responded to opportunities of repentance will enter the perfected kingdom before the externally righteous by whom like opportunities have been missed (Matt. xxi. 31, 32). The failure to use the privileges of the kingdom and fulfil its responsibilities may lead to the loss of it (Matt. xxi. 43). Within the kingdom there is need of spiritual foresight and prudence and watchfulness and care (Matt. xxv. 1-13). Those only are fit for it who will give whole-hearted service (Luke ix. 62). Our Lord summed up its characteristics when He told Pilate that it 'is not of this world' (John xviii. 36); and the sustaining power for the lives of its members is that personal presence of Himself, which, no less than His commission for work, He declared to be the outcome of the complete 'authority' which had 'been given unto' Him 'in heaven and on earth' (Matt. xxviii. 18-20).[1]

[1] See Church, *Advent Sermons*, pp. 67-86; Liddon, *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, pp. 101-107; Butler, *Analogy of Religion*, Part II. chap. i.; and *Sermon preached before the S.P.G.*

CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

The 'Kingdom of God' in the Acts.—The work of our Lord during the Great Forty Days, which elapsed between His resurrection and His ascension, is described in the Acts of the Apostles as that of 'speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God' (Acts i. 3). And in the history of Christian life in the years following the ascension which the same book supplies, this description of the Church is prominent. When 'Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and proclaimed unto them the Christ,' His teaching is incidentally described as 'preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ' (Acts viii. 5, 12). It was the 'kingdom of God' which S. Paul taught the people of Asia they 'must enter' 'through many tribulations' (Acts xiv. 22). The same apostle's work at Ephesus was that of 'reasoning and persuading as to the things concerning the kingdom of God' (Acts xix. 8; cf. xx. 25). After he reached Rome, in his ministry both to Jews and to Gentiles, he is described as 'testifying the kingdom of God, and persuading them concerning Jesus,' and 'preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ' (Acts xxviii. 23, 31). As in the Gospels, so in the Acts, the phrase has the twofold aspect of denoting the actual visible Church which now is, and the perfected Church which has yet to be manifested.

The Church in the Acts as a Visible Society.—The history of the Church recorded in the Acts is the history of a visible society. There are moral and spiritual actions

required in the adults[1] who seek admission to it. When those who had heard the sermon of S. Peter on the Day of Pentecost 'were pricked in their heart,' and asked, 'What shall we do?' the answer which they received included the words, 'Repent ye' (Acts ii. 37, 38). When the Philippian gaoler asked S. Paul and S. Silas, 'What must I do to be saved?' he was told, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus' (Acts xvi. 30, 31). But in his answer to the first converts S. Peter went on to say, 'And be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins'; the historian S. Luke records, 'They then that received his word were baptized' (Acts ii. 38-41); and in the later history, Baptism is consistently represented as the means of admission to the life of Christians. The Samaritans and the 'man of Ethiopia,' to whom S. Philip preached, S. Paul after his conversion, Cornelius with his 'kinsmen and his near friends,' the 'seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira,' 'named Lydia,' with 'her household' at Philippi, the gaoler, and 'all his' at the same place, the Corinthians who 'believed' in consequence of the preaching of S. Paul, and the Ephesians who had been disciples of S. John the Baptist, all received Holy Baptism that they might become members of the Church (Acts viii. 12, 13, 16, 36, 38, ix. 18, x. 47, 48, xvi. 14, 15, 33, xviii. 8, xix. 1-5). After the admission of believers into the Church by the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, there were outward marks of that 'fellowship' of 'the apostles,' in which they 'continued steadfastly' (Acts ii. 42). There were the prayers said in common; the use for a time of services in the Temple 'with one accord'; the laying on of hands or Confirmation; and 'the breaking of bread' or celebration of the Holy Eucharist (Acts i. 14, ii. 42, 46, 47, iii. 1, iv. 23-31, viii. 14-17, xix. 6, xx. 7-11). There was a definite body of disciples, to which the baptized were 'added' or joined themselves (Acts ii. 41, 47, ix. 26, 27). The Christians who lived in one place, or city, or country, and those who

[1] As to whether infants were baptized in the days of the apostles, see pp. 19-21, 96 of the volume *Holy Baptism* in the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.'

comprised the whole Christian society, were known as 'the Church' (Acts v. 11, viii. 1, 3, ix. 31, xi. 22, 26, xii. 1, 5, xiii. 1, xiv. 23, 27, xv. 3, 4, 22, 41, xvi. 5, xviii. 22, xx. 17, 28). So much was this Church a visible society that in the earliest days there was the common use of worldly possessions, and it was frequent, though not compulsory (Acts v. 4), to sell property and place the proceeds in the hands of the apostles (Acts ii. 44, 45, iv. 32-37, v. 1-11). That the first preaching and reception of the Christian religion were moral and spiritual movements it is impossible to doubt; it is no less clear that the actual, present 'kingdom of God,' the Christian Church, is a visible society, known by external marks.

The Earliest Church Jewish and Hellenistic.—The difficulties felt a little later as to the admission of the Gentiles into the Church appear to imply that the nucleus of it at the time of the ascension of our Lord consisted of Jews only. The apostles were all Jews who dwelt in Palestine, though the names of two of them, S. Andrew and S. Philip, may denote that these were Hellenistic or Greek-speaking Jews (Matt. x. 2, 3; see also John xii. 20-22). It is probable that the rest of the 'hundred and twenty' who comprised 'the brethren' 'gathered together' before the Day of Pentecost (Acts i. 15) were also Jews of Palestine. It was to the 'men of Judæa' and those who were dwelling at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 14) that S. Peter appealed in his first sermon after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. Though those who were present included some 'from every nation under heaven,' they were 'Jews, devout men,' all belonging to the Jewish religion, all either Jews by race or proselytes (Acts ii. 6, 9-11). For some time the preaching of the gospel was addressed to Jews only, though the descent of S. Barnabas, 'a man of Cyprus by race' (Acts iv. 36), the position of 'the Grecian Jews' (Acts vi. 1), the Greek names of the 'seven men of good report,' and the fact that one of them was 'a proselyte of Antioch' (Acts vi. 3, 5) show that many of those who became Christians, while they had been adherents of the Jewish religion, were not Jewish in nationality.

The Admission of the Gentiles.—The martyrdom of S. Stephen formed the beginning of 'a great persecution against the Church which was in Jerusalem.' This persecution led to the dispersion of Christians. 'They were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, except the apostles' (Acts viii. 1). Those who were thus 'scattered abroad' 'went about preaching the word' (Acts viii. 4). S. Philip 'proclaimed' 'the Christ' to 'the people of Samaria'; and 'they believed' him 'preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ,' and 'were baptized, both men and women' (Acts viii. 5, 9, 12). S. Philip baptized also the 'man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians,' evidently a proselyte, since he 'had come to Jerusalem for to worship' (Acts viii. 27, 38). In both instances—in that of the Samaritans because of their foreign descent and their hostility to the Jews, in that of the Ethiopian eunuch because of a ceremonial enactment of the Jewish Law (Deut. xxiii. 1)—steps were taken towards the expansion of the Church. The vision seen by S. Peter on the housetop at Joppa, the conversion of Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends, the gift to them of the Holy Ghost, and their reception of Baptism made it plain to the apostles and the brethren that were in Judæa that 'to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life' (Acts x. 1-xi. 18). And, though those 'that were scattered abroad upon the tribulation that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phœnicia, and Cyprus, and Antioch, speaking the word to none save only to Jews,' yet 'there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus' (Acts xi. 19, 20).[1] Subsequently S. Paul and S. Barnabas, after they had 'proclaimed the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews' at Salamis, and had preached in the Jewish synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, on the rejection of their teaching by the Jews at the latter place, made the declaration,

[1] It is possible, however, that the right reading is 'Grecian-Jews' (Ἑλληνιστάς), not 'Greeks' (Ἕλληνας).

'It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth,' with the consequence that 'As the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of God' (Acts xiii. 5, 14, 43–48). At Iconium, a little later, 'a great multitude both of Jews and of Greeks believed'; and on the return of S. Paul and S. Barnabas to Antioch at the end of their missionary journey, 'they rehearsed all things that God had done with them, and how that He had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles' (Acts xiv. 1, 27).

The Council of Jerusalem.—The exclusiveness of Jewish ideas made it inevitable that questions should be raised as to the position and obligations of the Gentiles in the Christian Church. That it was possible for them to become Christians does not appear to have been questioned after the missionary journey of S. Paul and S. Barnabas. But it was contended that a necessary step to membership in the Church was compliance with the regulations of the Jewish law, and that no Gentiles could be Christians unless they were also Jewish proselytes. So it came to pass at Antioch, that 'certain men came down from Judæa and taught the brethren, saying, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved' (Acts xv. 1). This contention met with strong opposition from S. Paul and S. Barnabas, and in consequence it was arranged that these two apostles, together with 'certain other' Christians 'should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and presbyters about this question' (Acts xv. 2). On their way up to Jerusalem, they 'passed through both Phœnicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles,' and 'caused great joy unto all the brethren' (Acts xv. 3). On their arrival at Jerusalem, the apostles and presbyters assembled in the presence of the Christian community to consider the matter, and after discussion it was determined by them, together with the whole Church at Jerusalem, that a

letter should be sent to the Gentile Christians in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia in the name of the apostles and presbyters to declare, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, it shall be well with you' (Acts xv. 4-29). The position of the Gentiles in the Church was thus secured; and while the prejudices of the Jewish Christians were dealt with tenderly by concessions on some minor points, the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the characteristic obligation of the Jewish Law in the rite of circumcision was affirmed.

Local Churches and the whole Church. — The word 'Church' is used in the Acts to denote the Christians in one city or in a particular country. Thus, we read of 'the Church which was at Jerusalem,' 'the Church' with reference to Antioch, and the Churches in various parts of Asia Minor and Syria (Acts viii. 1, xi. 22, 26, xiii. 1, xiv. 23, xv. 41, xvi. 5). It is used also to describe the Christian community in one place or in general in contrast with those who were not Christians (Acts v. 11, viii. 3, xii. 1, 5, xiv. 27, xv. 3, 4, 22, xviii. 22, xx. 17, 28) and regarded as comprising one body (Acts ix. 31). By comparing the different ways in which the word is used, it may be seen that all those who accepted the Christian religion and were baptized and remained in the doctrine and communion of the apostles were considered to form a single society, the Church of God, and that the separate bodies of Christians in different places were simply component parts of this organic whole.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH IN THE EPISTLES AND THE REVELATION

The 'Kingdom of God' in the Epistles and the Revelation.—It has been pointed out that in the Acts of the Apostles the phrase 'the kingdom of God' denotes both the visible Church of the life which now is and the perfected Church of the life which is to come; and that in the Gospels the 'kingdom' is represented as present and future, as outward and inward, as having external organisation and spiritual reality. These different aspects of the 'kingdom of God' appear in the Epistles also. S. Paul wrote to the Romans, 'The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' (Rom. xiv. 17). He taught the Corinthians, 'The kingdom of God is not in word but in power'; 'The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God'; 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (1 Cor. iv. 20, vi. 9, xv. 50). Writing to the same body of Christians, he referred to 'the kingdom' as that future perfected society of redeemed souls which our Lord Jesus Christ 'shall deliver up' 'to God, even the Father' at 'the end,' 'when He shall have abolished all rule and authority and power,' and 'put all His enemies,' including 'death,' 'the last enemy that shall be abolished,' 'under His feet' (1 Cor. xv. 24-26). Similarly, in the Epistle to the Galatians, after specifying with some detail 'the works of the flesh,' S. Paul added, 'Of the which I forewarn you, even as I did forewarn you, that they which practise such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God' (Gal. v. 21); in the Epistle to the Ephesians he said 'that no fornicator, nor unclean person, nor covetous

man which is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God' (Eph. v. 5); and in the Second Epistle to S. Timothy he wrote of the 'heavenly kingdom' of 'the Lord' unto which he hoped to be saved (2 Tim. iv. 18). In two passages in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, and in one passage in the Second Epistle to S. Timothy, the idea of the 'kingdom' seems to include both its present visible aspect and its future perfected state (1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 1). In the Epistle to the Colossians, in one passage certainly, and in another passage probably, 'the kingdom of God' denotes the existing visible Church. 'Giving thanks unto the Father,' it is said, 'who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us' (that is, in Bishop Lightfoot's words, 'when they were baptized, when they accepted Christ') 'into the kingdom of the Son of His love'; and 'These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God' (Col. i. 13, iv. 11). S. Peter in his Second Epistle uses the phrase 'the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ' for that which is to be hereafter (2 Pet. i. 11); and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews and S. James speak of the 'kingdom' in a sense which appears to include, like three passages in the Epistles of S. Paul, the Church both in its existing and in its final state (Heb. xii. 28; James ii. 5). In the Revelation of S. John, the 'kingdom' or 'the kingdom of God' is used in some passages for the Church in the present (Rev. i. 6, 9; v. 10), in others for the perfected Church (Rev. xi. 15, xii. 10).

Local Churches and the whole Church.—As in the Acts of the Apostles, so in the Epistles of S. Paul local bodies of Christians were called 'the Church' in relation to the place where they lived or worshipped. Thus, there were at Rome and Ephesus 'the Church' in the 'house' of Prisca and Aquila (Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19); at Laodicea 'the Church' 'in' the 'house' of the brethren of that place or of Nymphas (Col. iv. 15; see R.V. margin and A.V.); in various places 'the Churches of the Gentiles' (Rom. xvi. 4); in Galatia 'the Churches of' that district (1 Cor. xvi. 1; cf. Gal. i. 2); in Asia 'the

Churches of' that province (1 Cor. xvi. 19); 'the Church of the Laodiceans' (Col. iv. 16); 'the Church of the Thessalonians' (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1); 'the Churches of Macedonia' (2 Cor. viii. 1); 'the Church that is at Cenchreæ' (Rom. xvi. 1); 'the Church of God which is at Corinth' (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1); and 'the Churches of God which are in Judæa in Christ Jesus' (1 Thess. ii. 14). In the Revelation also the body of Christians in each of the seven cities to which the second and third chapters of the book are specially addressed is called 'the Church in' that place (Rev. i. 4, 11, 20, ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 7, 14). But this use of the word 'Church' does not exhaust the meaning of the term in the Epistles any more than in the Acts. In them also 'the Church' denotes Christians in general contrasted with Jews and the heathen, and the whole body of Christians as a visible society chosen and called by God. Thus, in describing Christians in general S. Paul wrote, 'Give no occasion of stumbling, either to Jews, or to Greeks, or to the Church of God' (1 Cor. x. 32); 'God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers' (1 Cor. xii. 28); 'I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God' (1 Cor. xv. 9); 'Beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God and made havock of it' (Gal. i. 13); 'As touching zeal, persecuting the Church' (Phil. iii. 6). And referring to the whole body of the Universal Church, the same apostle in his letters to the Ephesians and the Colossians spoke of the Church as that community of Christians which has its distinctive character because it is 'the body of Christ' (Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 12, v. 23, 29, 30; Col. i. 18, 24). Here, as in the Acts of the Apostles, the separate Churches are but parts of the one organism of the Universal Church.

The Sacramental Life of the Church.—The Epistles supply the doctrinal explanation of the facts recorded in the Acts of the Apostles that admission into the Church was by means of Baptism, and that part of the life of the members of the Church consisted in the reception of the Holy Communion.

Baptism.—In the Acts, indeed, there is much to show that Baptism was no merely ceremonial act, no mere sign, no mere and arbitrarily appointed way of entrance into the kingdom of heaven. Even if it were nothing more, it might still have had its purpose and its use. For admission into a society some act is necessary whereby individuals are received and incorporated so that they may have part in the privileges and responsibilities of the body. But the book of the Acts describes Baptism as the means of receiving 'the gift of the Holy Ghost' and of being 'filled with the Holy Ghost'; as supplying an instrument to be used by one who wished 'to be saved'; and as enabling a convert to Christianity to 'wash away' his 'sins' (Acts ii. 38, ix. 17, 18, xvi. 30, 33, xxii. 16). The teaching contained in the Acts is more fully explained in the Epistles. Corresponding to our Lord's reference to Holy Baptism as effecting the state which He calls that of being 'begotten anew' (John iii. 3, 5) are S. Paul's description of this Sacrament as 'the washing of regeneration' (Tit. iii. 5),[1] and his teaching that to be 'baptized into Christ' and 'into His death' is to 'put on Christ' and be joined 'into' His 'one body' and thus to become 'sons of God' (Rom. vi. 3, 4, viii. 14-19; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27; Gal. iii. 26, 27; Eph. v. 26-30). In Baptism, moreover, there is, in S. Paul's words, the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost' (Tit. iii. 5); and, according to the teaching of S. Peter, the regeneration which is accomplished by Baptism leads to 'an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven' and 'doth now save' (1 Pet. i. 3, 4, iii. 21).[2]

The Holy Communion.—The book of the Acts simply records the fact of the administration and reception of the Holy Communion, and does not touch upon the doctrine of this Sacrament. The Epistles show that to be a communicant was an ordinary part of Christian

[1] For the evidence that this passage refers to Holy Baptism, see Pusey, *Doctrine of Holy Baptism*, pp. 53-64.

[2] For a fuller treatment of these passages, see pp. 25-39 of the volume *Holy Baptism* in the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.'

life, and, as in the case of Baptism, afford doctrinal explanation of this fact. In his First Epistle to the Corinthians, S. Paul refers to the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist as customary and well known and a recognised part of the worship of the Church (1 Cor. x. 16-22, xi. 23-34); and declares it to be a means of participation in the life of Christ Himself and a remembrance and pleading of His death, since the 'cup' is the 'communion of the blood of Christ,' and the 'bread' is the 'communion of the body of Christ,' and to eat the bread and drink the cup is to 'proclaim the Lord's death till He come' (1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 26).

Confirmation.—The rite of Confirmation, described in the Acts as administered to those who by means of Baptism had been made Christians and as the means of conveying the Holy Ghost (Acts viii. 14-17, xix. 6), is mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews as one of 'the first principles of Christ' (Heb. vi. 1, 2); and it is highly probable that, when S. Paul refers to the anointing and sealing of Christians (2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30), he alludes to Confirmation.

The Church the Body of Christ.—It is a result of the union with our Lord in which Christians are placed by Baptism and fully maintained by Communion that the whole Church is the body of Christ. 'We, who are many,' says S. Paul, 'are one body in Christ'; 'We, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread'; 'As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body'; 'Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof'; 'The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory' 'gave' 'Christ' 'to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all'; 'He gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ,' 'that we' 'may grow up in all things into Him, which is the Head, even Christ; from whom all

the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love'; 'The husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the Head of the Church, being Himself the Saviour of the body'; 'We are members of His body'; 'He is the Head of the body, the Church'; 'I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church'; 'Let no man' 'judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day; which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's. Let no man rob you of your prize by a voluntary humility and worshipping of the angels, dwelling in the things which he hath seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding fast the Head, from whom all the body, being supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God' (Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 12, 13, 27; Eph. i. 17, 19, 22, 23, iv. 11, 12, 15, 16, v. 23, 30; Col. i. 18, 24, ii. 16-19). Thus, in many passages in his Epistles S. Paul insists that, as truly as the several limbs of the natural body are parts of that body, so truly individual Christians are members of Christ, and the whole Church is the body with which He is sometimes identified, and of which He is sometimes represented as the Head.[1]

The Church the Bride of Christ.—S. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, 'I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ' (2 Cor. xi. 2). At an earlier time, writing to the same community of Christians, he had expressed what is fundamentally the same idea in a different way, 'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ'; 'The twain, saith He, shall become one flesh. But he that is joined unto the

[1] The consequences involved in S. Paul's doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ and of Christ as the Head of the Church cannot be thought to have been, as yet, adequately considered in the writings of theologians.

Lord is one spirit' (1 Cor. vi. 15-17). Later, writing to the Ephesians, he showed how this union of local Churches and individual Christians with our Lord leads up to the fact, correlative to the truth that the Church is His body, that the whole Church is the bride of Christ. 'The husband,' he wrote, 'is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the Head of the Church, being Himself the Saviour of the body. But as the Church is subject to Christ, so let the wives also be to their husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his own wife loveth himself: for no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ also the Church; because we are members of His body. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh. This mystery is great: but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church' (Eph. v. 23-32). So, in the Revelation of S. John, the Church, which S. Paul represents as being even in the present world the bride of Christ, is depicted in her perfected glory as holding the same relation to her Lord. 'Let us rejoice,' are the words of the 'great multitude in heaven' whose voice S. John heard, 'and be exceeding glad, and let us give glory unto Him' (that is, 'the Lord our God, the Almighty'), 'for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready. And to her it was given that she should array herself in fine linen, bright and pure: for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints'; 'I saw,' says S. John himself, describing the vision of the future perfection of the Church, 'the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband'; 'And there came one of the seven angels,' 'and he spake with me, saying, Come

hither, I will show thee the bride, the wife of the Lamb. And he carried me away in the Spirit to a mountain great and high, and showed me the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God' (Rev. xix. 7, 8, xxi. 2, 9-11; cf. xxii. 17). Thus the New Testament shows how the Church, in her earthly life and her heavenly glory, affords the fulfilment of the Psalmist's words of prophecy.

'Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear;
Forget also thine own people, and thy father's house;
So shall the king desire thy beauty:
For He is thy Lord; and worship thou Him.
And the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift;
Even the rich among the people shall intreat thy favour.

The king's daughter within the palace is all glorious;
Her clothing is inwrought with gold.
She shall be led unto the king in broidered work:
The virgins her companions that follow her
Shall be brought unto Thee.
With gladness and rejoicing shall they be led.
They shall enter into the king's palace.'—(Ps. xlv. 10-15.)

The Church the Temple of God.—The aspect of Christian life by which it is seen to be in union with our Lord leads naturally to the conception of the Church as the body and the bride of Christ. Similarly, the doctrine of the indwelling of Christians by the Holy Ghost involves the representation of the Church as the temple of God. This representation was implied in the teaching of our Lord Himself. In His promise of the existence and perpetuity of the Church He said to S. Peter, 'Upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it' (Matt. xvi. 18). The idea which our Lord suggested was more fully developed by S. Paul. He referred to the work of his own ministry and the ministry of others as that of a builder, and added that Christians were the temple of God. 'According to the grace of God which was given unto me,' he wrote to the Corinthians, 'as a wise master-builder I laid a foundation; and another buildeth thereon. But let each man take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus

Christ'; 'Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' (1 Cor. iii. 10, 11, 16; cf. 2 Cor. vi. 16). What he thus said of the Christians at Corinth collectively, he said also of individual Christians at the same place in the words, 'Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost?' (1 Cor. vi. 19). And in the Epistle to the Ephesians he expanded this thought as it applies to the Universal Church, and explained the relation between the different parts and the whole. 'Ye,' he said, 'are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit' (Eph. ii. 19-22).

The Church in the Present and in the Future.—Throughout the descriptions of the Church as the body and bride of Christ and as the temple of God it is clear that the thought of its future perfect state is never very far away; and this is the prominent idea in the picture of the bride in the Revelation. At the same time, it is no less clear that in S. Paul's writings it is the actual visible Church in its present state to which reference is thus made. The future realisation of the ideal condition of the Church is not forgotten; but even amid the imperfections which may now be discerned the Church is described in the splendid terms which depict it as body and bride and temple, since even in the present it is a supernatural society, a divine institution, participating in the life of God through union with Christ.

Evil mingled with Good in the Visible Church.—Magnificent as is the conception of the Church which is found in the Epistles, that view of it which is presented in our Lord's parables of the tares among the wheat and of the net cast into the sea is not forgotten. The whole Christian body in any place is indeed addressed as 'the saints' (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 2; cf. Acts. ix. 32) in virtue of the

position of each member of it as one who in Baptism has been set free from sin by his union with our Lord and the operation of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. vi. 11). But within the temple which is upon the foundation Jesus Christ there may be building of 'gold,' or 'silver,' or 'costly stones,' or 'wood,' or 'hay,' or 'stubble' (1 Cor. iii. 11, 12); the 'treasure' even of the ministry is 'in earthen vessels' (2 Cor. iv. 7); in the 'great house' of the Church 'there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some unto honour, and some unto dishonour' (2 Tim. ii. 20); some in the society described as 'the saints' are reproved for grievous sins (*e.g.* 1 Cor. *passim*); and the circumstances which arise when a 'man that is named a brother' is 'a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner' have to be taken into account (1 Cor. v. 11).

The Church One.—'One bread, one body,' 'one body in Christ,' are phrases in which S. Paul describes the Church. This unity comprises more than that Christians are in common members of a visible organisation. It involves not only the idea expressed by our Lord when He spoke of 'one flock' (John x. 16), but also that conveyed by His comparison of Himself and His people to 'the vine' and 'the branches' (John xv. 1-8); and consequently it rests upon the participation of Christians in the life of Christ. This inner, hidden unity, by which all who in Holy Baptism have been made members of Christ and have received the indwelling of the Holy Ghost have share in the one life of our Lord which is the possession of His body the Church, shows itself, on its outward side, in different aspects. The worship of the one true God, the acceptance of the one true faith, the sharing in the one Baptism by means of which Christian life is bestowed and the one Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ by which it may be fully maintained, the possession of the one hope of eternal life in the presence of God, the reception of the influence and the indwelling of the one Spirit,—these are described by S. Paul as marks of the unity of the Church. 'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as

also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all'; 'In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit'; 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread' (Eph. iv. 4, 5; 1 Cor. xii. 13, x. 16, 17). But all unity which proceeds from outward organisation has its meaning and its value because it is the sign of that union with Christ through which all who are joined with Him are in Him joined together with one another.

The Church Holy.—The one Church, the mystical body of Christ, is regarded in the New Testament as holy in spite of the presence of bad members within it. That perfect holiness is the ideal and is to be the final state of the Church—a truth taught by our Lord Himself in His many exhortations to righteousness (*e.g.* Matt. v.) and in His description of the casting out of evil in the day of judgment (Matt. xiii. 30, 49, 50, xxiv. 50, 51, xxv. 11, 12, 30)—is shown in the description of the bride of Christ in the glory of the marriage feast as arrayed in 'fine linen, bright and pure,' the 'fine linen' of 'the righteous acts of the saints' (Rev. xix. 8); S. Paul's assertion of the purpose of Christ to 'sanctify' the Church, 'having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish' (Eph. v. 26, 27), and to 'redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works' (Tit. ii. 14); and the same apostle's aim that he 'might present' the Corinthians 'as a pure virgin to Christ' (2 Cor. xi. 2). That the Church as a whole can be regarded as holy is shown by the practice already mentioned (see p. 31) of addressing the Christian society in any place as the 'saints,' and such phrases as that it is 'a holy temple' (Eph. ii. 21).

The Universal Mission of the Church.—Though our Lord for the most part confined His ministry to the Jews (Matt. xv. 24), He plainly taught His apostles that their mission was to be world-wide when, before His ascension, He commanded them, 'Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations' (Matt. xxviii. 19), or, in the words of S. Mark's Gospel, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation' (Mark xvi. 15), or, as recorded by S. Luke, 'that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem' (Luke xxiv. 47). The admission of the Gentiles without the rite of circumcision was the method in which the Church of the apostles gave effect to the spirit of our Lord's command; and the importance of the decision of the Council of Jerusalem and the practical as distinct from the doctrinal significance of the teaching of S. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians were connected with the need of maintaining the universal character of the work of the Church. S. Paul's Epistles generally, in their insistence on the truth that 'there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all and in all' (Col. iii. 11; cf. Acts xvii. 26), show that there cannot be any narrower ideal for the Church than that it extends throughout the world. The Revelation depicts as part of the destined future that 'the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ' (Rev. xi. 15). In this teaching the New Testament exhibits the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Psalmists:—

'The Lord said unto Me, Thou art My Son;
This day have I begotten Thee.
Ask of Me, and I will give Thee the nations for Thine inheritance,
And the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession.'

'All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord:
And all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee.'

'He shall have dominion also from sea to sea,
And from the River unto the ends of the earth.

They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before Him;
And His enemies shall lick the dust.
The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents:
The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts.
Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him:
All nations shall serve Him.'—(Ps. ii. 7, 8, xxii. 27, lxxii. 8-11.)

The Church in Union with the Apostles.—It has already been pointed out (p. 18) that the Christian society of the time immediately following the descent of the Holy Ghost 'continued' 'in the apostles' teaching and fellowship.' This outward union was a sign of the inward unity by which the one body of Christians was held together in Christ. In the outward union and in the inward unity those thus knit together were necessarily linked with the apostles as sharing in the one sacramental life derived from Christ the Head. S. Paul, writing to the Ephesians, described the actual Church of the present life as 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner stone' (Eph. ii. 20). Of the perfected Church depicted in the Revelation S. John said, 'The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb' (Rev. xxi. 14).

The Church the Inheritor of the Promises to Israel.—In the Epistle to the Galatians S. Paul refers to the Church as 'the Israel of God.' 'As many as walk by this rule,' he says, 'peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God' (Gal. vi. 16). This line of thought is more explicitly developed by S. Peter in his First Epistle. The phraseology he uses with reference to the Church is based upon the descriptions of the nation of Israel in the Old Testament. In the words which the Lord commanded Moses to speak unto 'the house of Jacob,' 'the children of Israel,' summing up very much which was said elsewhere, the Israelite nation was addressed, 'Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me from among all peoples: for all the earth is Mine: and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation' (Ex. xix. 5, 6). With this description of Israel plainly in view, S. Peter addresses the Christian Church, 'Ye,' 'as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy

priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. Because it is contained in Scripture,

> Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious:
> And he that believeth on Him shall not be put to shame.

For you, therefore, that believe is the preciousness: but for such as disbelieve,

> The stone which the builders rejected,
> The same was made the head of the corner;

and,

> A stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence;

for they stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed. But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the excellences of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light: which in time past were no people, but now are the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy' (1 Pet. ii. 5-10). S. Peter also describes the Church as 'the house of God' and 'the flock of God' (1 Pet. iv. 17, v. 2), as well as 'the brotherhood' (1 Pet. ii. 17, v. 9). In his Second Epistle he refers to the privilege of sacramental participation in the life of God by which Christians are distinguished from those who had attained to the greatest heights in the nation of Israel (cf. Matt. xi. 11), by mentioning as an object of God's call to Christians that 'through His precious and exceeding great promises' they 'may become partakers of the divine nature' (2 Pet. i. 4).

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY LATER THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT: A VISIBLE SOCIETY

Introductory.—The New Testament conception of the Church as a society of Christians, known by outward marks, the inheritor of the promises to Israel in the Old Testament, called by God to serve Him on earth in preparation for an unending life of perfect service, is found throughout the whole course of later history.

The Fathers.—In the writings of the Fathers of all periods, both in the East and in the West, the Church is consistently regarded as a body such as is depicted in the New Testament. It is but an instance of the general trend of patristic thought that S. Augustine describes the Church as the city of God set on a hill, not to be hid, as the field of God in which till the day of judgment the tares will grow together with the wheat, as formed by the Sacrament of Baptism in which the baptized are made members of Christ and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in which they are preserved in spiritual life.[1] To quote one passage out of the full and rich teaching which his writings contain: 'There has been shown the city set upon a hill, which cannot be hid, and the light placed on a candlestick, which shows its brightness to all who are in the house. For where does the Church of Christ lie hid? where does the truth of Christ lie hid? Is He not the mountain which grew out of the least of stones, and filled the whole face of the earth?'[2] That

[1] The writings of S. Augustine against the Donatists, particularly *De Baptismo contra Donatistos*, and his treatise *De civitate Dei*, are full of such teaching.

[2] S. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. LVII.*, 9.

he sometimes distinguished the 'interior' Church, or the 'real' body, from the visible society, only shows that he allowed for the presence of the tares among the wheat, the bad members together with the good, and referred in this special way to those persons within the visible Church who were faithful to their obligations as Christians, and, on his view of predestination, the objects of divine election, not that he set up the idea of an invisible Church separate from the visible society to which he unquestionably referred as the city of God and the body of Christ.[1]

The Middle Ages.—As in the Fathers, so throughout the middle ages the idea of the Church is that of a visible society. It was indeed maintained on occasion that the Church has its invisible part consisting of those who have attained to the glory towards which those who are seen in the visible Church on earth are making their way;[2] but this recognition that the Church includes those who have passed within the veil as well as those who are still living in this world was in no sense a distinction of an invisible and a visible Church in those who are yet alive upon earth.

The Present Time.—At the present time it is the teaching of all the parts of the Church that the Church is a visible society.

The Church of England.—The formularies of the Church of England were drawn up in full view of a distinction between an invisible and a visible Church, made by Wyclif, adopted by Hus, influential among the foreign reformers, not without effect in some English documents of the reign of Henry VIII., and accepted by, among others, Hooper, the Bishop of Gloucester, in the reign of Edward VI.[3] Throughout these formularies the representation of the Church is in accordance with the

[1] See a valuable statement in Bright, *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, pp. 280-85.

[2] See, *e.g.*, S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III. viii. 4 ad 2.

[3] See Kidd, *The Thirty-nine Articles* (in this series), pp. 164, 165; Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, p. 499.

historical conception of it as a visible society. The phrases, 'Thy holy Church universal' in the Litany, 'the good estate of the Catholic Church' in the Prayer for all sorts and conditions of men, 'an universal Church' and 'Thy Church' in the Prayers for the Ember Weeks, 'the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth' in the Order of Holy Communion, and the language used throughout the offices for the Ministration of Holy Baptism, are obviously meant to denote that the Church is a visible body known by outward marks; in the nineteenth of the Articles of Religion a definition in accordance with the historical belief is used when it is said that 'the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men,[1] in the which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same'; and in the twenty-sixth of the same Articles it is allowed that 'in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good,' and even that 'sometime the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments.'

The Church of Rome.—The authorised teaching of the Church of Rome demands different limits for the Church than those assigned in the Church of England. It asserts no less clearly the visible character of the Church, and that within it the evil are mingled with the good.[2]

The East.—The same is true of the East. The Council of Bethlehem of A.D. 1672 stated: 'We believe that all the faithful, and the faithful only, are members of the Catholic Church, that is, those who hold and keep inviolable the Faith of our Saviour Christ, delivered by Christ Himself and the apostles, and the holy Œcumenical Councils, even though some of them may be guilty of all kinds of sins. For the faithful who are living in sin could not be judged by the Church if they were not members of the Church. But as it is, when they are defiled by sin they are judged by the Church

[1] *i.e.* professed believers: see Kidd, *op. cit.*, p. 171; Gibson, *op. cit.*, p. 502.

[2] See the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, I. x. 7.

and exhorted to repentance, and directed to the exercise of its healthful commandments; and, so long as they have not fallen into despair, and hold to the Catholic and orthodox faith, they are and are recognised as members of the Catholic Church.'[1] And the *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church* expressly says that the Church is 'visible,' and defines it as 'a divinely instituted community of men, united by the orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the Sacraments.'[2]

The Invisible Side of the Visible Church.—That this visible society has its invisible side in those who have departed this life in the faith and fear of Christ is a truth which each part of the Church has preserved. It is emphatically expressed in the Collect of the Church of England for All Saints' Day, written for the Prayer Book of 1549, in which, with evident reference to the departed Saints, it is said that God has 'knit together' His 'elect in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body of' 'Christ our Lord.' It is implied in the whole structure of the Roman Mass, in which supplication is made for the living and the departed, and the glorified Saints are closely associated with the action of the Church on earth.[3] In the East, the *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church* contains the question, 'How can the Church, which is visible, be the object of faith, when faith, as the apostle says, is "the evidence of things not seen"?' and the answer, 'First, though the Church be visible, the grace of God which dwells in her, and in those who are sanctified in her, is not so; and this it is which properly constitutes the object of faith in the Church. Secondly, the Church, though visible so far as she is upon earth, and contains all orthodox Christians living upon earth, still is at the same time invisible, so far as she is also partially in heaven, and contains all those that have departed hence in true faith and holiness.'[4]

[1] Council of Bethlehem, xi.
[2] See Blackmore, *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, p. 75.
[3] See also *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, I. x. 5; and Addis, Arnold, and Scannell, *A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 185.
[4] Blackmore, *op. cit.*, pp. 75, 76.

Admission to the Church by Means of Baptism.—It has been continuously taught within the Church that admission to it is obtained by means of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. The teaching on this subject contained in the Baptismal Offices of the English Church represents truly the historical doctrine of the whole Church. In that for the Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants the priest is directed to describe in the opening exhortation the act of Baptism as effecting that the child may be 'received into Christ's holy Church, and be made a lively member of the same'; to pray that he 'may be received into the ark of Christ's Church'; and after the Baptism to say, 'We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy holy Spirit, to receive him for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy holy Church.' The Offices for the Private Baptism of Children and the Baptism of Adults contain similar teaching.

Those within the Early Church Confirmed and Communicants.—In the early Church Baptism did not stand alone. With it the rite of Confirmation was closely connected. In all ordinary cases those who were baptized, both children and adults, were at once confirmed. Their Baptism and Confirmation were immediately followed by their reception of the Holy Communion.[1] To receive Baptism and Confirmation without also receiving the Holy Communion would, in any ordinary circumstances, have been impossible. To continue to be a communicant was a recognised part of the life of any within the Church.

The Present Time.—To some extent this aspect of membership in the Church has been obscured in the West by the discontinuance of the primitive practice of Infant Confirmation and Infant Communion which the East has retained. But, though the emphasis on a valuable truth has thus been made less, both the Church of Rome and the English Church insist on the necessity of reception of the Holy Communion on the part of those who have attained to the age of reason. The Church of

[1] See pp. 162-181 of the volume *Holy Baptism* in the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.'

Rome requires her members to communicate at least once a year at the Easter season;[1] and, though frequently administering Communion before Confirmation, yet takes pains to secure that the latter rite is received. The English Church orders in the Office for the Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, that baptized children 'be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him so soon as they can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue, and be further instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose'; in the Order of Confirmation that 'none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed,' implying that those who have been confirmed (who according to the Prayer Book rule will include all who know the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Church Catechism) are to be admitted to Communion; and in the Order of Holy Communion that 'every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one.'

Belief in the Christian Faith.—From the earliest times, belief in the chief doctrines of the Christian religion has been requisite for members of the Church.[2] This requirement has been maintained in theory to the present time. The Churches of the East, the Church of Rome, and the English Church differ in some respects as to what they require from their members. They agree in the need of the acceptance of the central doctrines of the Christian faith. In the English Church, one of the conditions of Baptism is belief, on the part of the person baptized, or of the sponsors, in the Apostles' Creed; candidates for Confirmation are required to 'renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in' their 'name at' their 'Baptism,' which includes the act of belief, before they are confirmed by the Bishop; and the saying or singing of the enlarged form of the Nicene Creed is directed to form a part of every celebration of the Holy Communion.

[1] Lateran Council of A.D. 1215, cap. 21.

[2] See pp. 151-155, 164-168 of *Holy Baptism*.

The Visible Church the Sphere of Covenanted Salvation.—From the earliest days of Christianity, to enter the visible Church by the Sacrament of Holy Baptism was regarded as an act of passing out of death into life. The sense of the hold which sin had on the world and of the privileges of the Christian religion not unnaturally led to a very dark view of the present condition and future lot of those who lived and died outside the communion of the Church. In the third and following centuries such statements as 'outside the Church no salvation,'[1] were made with the meaning that those who did not become members of the visible Church in this life were eternally lost. Though S. Augustine, in his struggles to recognise the significance of different sides of human life, admitted much as to the possibilities of the heathen before the coming of Christ and as to the work of grace among the predestined who in Christian times were for a while outside the visible communion of the Church, he does not appear to have contemplated that any who were not within the visible Church at death, unless indeed they had been prevented from receiving Baptism by some accident,[2] or being members of the Church had been excommunicated by an unjust sentence,[3] would attain to eternal salvation. The ideas about grace and merit which prevailed among some of the schoolmen, gave a milder aspect to their teaching. A terrible sternness marked the thought of the period of the Reformation on subjects of this kind.[4] Of late years there has been a strong tendency to lay stress on assertions of the good received within the Church, and to maintain an attitude of reserve as to the state of those outside it, and to interpret the word 'salvation' in the sentence 'outside the Church no salvation' in the sense of 'the security of the covenant.'[5]

[1] This phrase is first found in S. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiii. 21.

[2] S. Augustine, *De Bapt. c. Don.*, iv. 29.

[3] *Idem*, *De vera relig.*, 11.

[4] The general idea of the visible Church was maintained by some Lutherans and by Calvin, as well as in the Church of England.

[5] See Gore, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 319, 320. On the connected question of the state of those who die unbaptized, see *Holy Baptism*, pp. 110-116.

CHAPTER VI

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY LATER THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT: UNITY

'Notes' of the Church.—In the additions to the Creed of Nicæa which were first authorised by the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381, or the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451,[1] the words 'One, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church' occur. Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity are often described as the four 'notes' or 'marks' of the Church.

The Organic Unity of the Church.—It has already been seen that S. Paul describes the unity of the Church as consisting in the relation of Christians to the one God, the one revealed faith, the one sacramental life, the one hope, and the indwelling of the one Spirit (see p. 32). This conception of Christian unity has never been altogether out of sight in the history of the Church, though at times and in places there has been a tendency to dwell chiefly on the visible unity of outward organisation rather than on the invisible unity in which the members of the visible Church inhere in Christ. Thus, in the writings of S. Cyprian,[2] and to some extent in those of S. Augustine,[3] and in a still higher degree in much modern Roman Catholic theology, the most prominent aspect of the unity of the Church is that of external organisation. But, while it is certainly true that such external and visible unity as is involved in the possession of the one sacramental life, the chief means of which are

[1] For a statement on this subject see Eck, *The Incarnation* ('Oxford Library of Practical Theology'), p. 266.

[2] See especially his *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*.

[3] See especially his treatises against the Donatists.

Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, is necessary to the unity which is a 'note' of the Church, there have been many recognitions in quarters of unsuspected orthodoxy of the truth that the essential unity, without which the Church cannot be, is participation in the one life of Christ. In a well-known passage in his book *On the Trinity* S. Hilary of Poitiers wrote, 'The apostle teaches that this unity of Christians results from the nature of the Sacraments, for he addressed the Galatians, "As many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ. There can be no Jew or Greek, there can be no slave or free, there can be no male or female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." That, in so great difference of race, position, and sex, they are one, is this a result of the assent of the will or of the unity of the Sacrament, since to these there is one Baptism, and they are all clothed in the one Christ? What, then, will agreement of minds do here, since they are one in this respect, that by means of the nature of the one Baptism they are clad in the one Christ?'[1] Similarly, to mention three great names in the West widely separated in point of time, S. Augustine,[2] S. Thomas Aquinas,[3] and Pope Leo XIII. lay stress on the fact that the Church has essential unity by inhering in her Head Christ. 'The Son of God,' wrote Leo XIII., 'decreed that the Church should be His mystical body, with which He should be united as the Head, after the manner of the human body which He assumed, to which the natural head is physiologically united.'[4] To add to these Western writers the teaching of the East at the present time, in the *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church* it is said, 'Why is the Church one?' 'Because she is one spiritual body, has one Head, Christ, and is animated by one Spirit of God. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one Baptism; one God and Father of

[1] S. Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trin.*, viii. 8 (cf. 7).
[2] See, *e.g.*, S. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. LVI.*, 1.
[3] See, *e.g.*, S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III. viii. 1, 6.
[4] Pope Leo XIII., Encyclical Letter *Satis cognitum*, p. 12 (p. xiv of authorised English translation).

all."' 'Are we still more expressly assured that Jesus Christ is the one only Head of the one Church?' 'The apostle Paul writes, that for the Church, as "the building of God, other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Wherefore the Church, as the body of Christ, can have no other head than Jesus Christ. The Church being to abide through all generations of time needs also an ever-abiding Head; and such is Jesus Christ alone. Wherefore, also, the apostles take no higher title than that of "Ministers of the Church."' 'What duty does the unity of the Church lay upon us?' 'That of "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."' 'How does it agree with the unity of the Church that there are many separate and independent Churches, as those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Russia?' 'These are particular Churches, or parts of the one Catholic Church: the separateness of their visible organisation does not hinder them from being all spiritually great members of the one body of the Universal Church, from having one Head, Christ, and one spirit of faith and grace. This unity is expressed outwardly by unity of Creed, and by communion in prayer and Sacraments.' 'Is there likewise unity between the Church on earth and the Church in heaven?' 'Doubtless there is both by their common relation to one Head, our Lord Jesus Christ, and by mutual communion with one another.'[1]

Organic and Moral Unity.—In the quotation just made from the *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church* it is taught that the essential unity of the Church lays on us the 'duty' of 'endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.' In other terminology, the objective or organic unity of the Church, which consists of common participation in the one life of Christ, ought to involve also the subjective or moral unity of the Church, which consists of peace and concord and the intercommunion of Christians with one another. To questions how far the objective or organic unity, a 'note' of the Church and essential to being in the Church, can be

[1] Blackmore, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, 78.

maintained if the subjective or moral unity has been lost, it would be difficult to obtain clear-cut and definite answers in the East. In the Church of Rome, on the other hand, they have been answered with great definiteness. To take as an instance the Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on the subject of unity from which a quotation has already been made (see p. 45), after the assertion of the need of unity by being in the body of which Christ is the Head, the Pope went on to maintain that the unity of the Church requires a supreme authority, and that a supreme authority necessitates an earthly head. 'Since,' he wrote, 'Christ willed that His kingdom should be visible, He was obliged, when He ascended into heaven, to designate a vicegerent on earth';[1] 'Jesus Christ, therefore, appointed Peter to be the head of the Church: and He also determined that the authority instituted in perpetuity for the salvation of all should be inherited by His successors, in whom the same permanent authority of Peter himself should continue.'[2] And from this point of view it is commonly taught by Roman Catholic theologians that, as the Church is a visible society, so also the essential unity which is a 'note' of the Church is visible, and one necessary part of this visible unity is that external intercommunion of Christians with one another which requires adhesion to the appointed head of the Church on earth, the Pope of Rome.

Roman Catholic Arguments.—This attitude of Roman Catholic theologians has been defended on two great grounds. On the ground of reason it has been maintained that the visible body of the Church must have a visible head; that the Church on earth being made up of men must have a head in the same order of thought, that is, a human head; and that unity ceases to be possible unless there is an earthly centre of unity. On the ground of authority it has been urged that the words

[1] Pope Leo XIII., *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 33 (p. XXXV of the authorised English translation, from which the above quotation is taken: the Latin phrase translated 'He was obliged to designate' is 'designare debuit').

[2] *Ibid.* p. 33 (p. XXXVI of the authorised English translation).

of our Lord Jesus Christ and the traditional doctrine and practice of the Church concur in teaching that this earthly centre of unity is to be found in the successors of S. Peter in the See of Rome, and that to be apart from the Pope is to be severed from the Church.

The Argument from Reason. — The argument thus brought forward on the ground of reason cannot be regarded as weighty. It is acknowledged on all sides that the visible Church on earth is only part of the Church, and that, in addition to those Christians now living on earth, the Church includes the departed and those who have yet to live. While it can logically be maintained that a body must have a head, it is not required by logic that a part of a body must have a head, and the Head of the whole body of the Church is our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Moreover, when it is said that the Church on earth, being made up of men, must have a head in the same order of thought and life, and this position is used to support the argument which requires external union with the Pope, it is forgotten that it is in virtue of His manhood[1] that our Lord is the Head of the Church, and that therefore as Man, He fills the position which this line of reasoning assigns to the Pope. An earthly centre of unity is necessary, as distinct from desirable, only on the supposition that external intercommunion is requisite to complete that unity which is a 'note' of the Church.

The Argument from Authority.—The argument based on authority needs fuller consideration.

Importance attached to External Unity by the Fathers.— It must be admitted that in the writings of the Fathers great importance is attached to unity of external organisation. Attention has already been directed to this aspect of the teaching of S. Cyprian and S. Augustine. To his insistence on the need of the objective unity which is accomplished by the sacraments, S. Cyprian, with evident reference to the visible unity of intercommunion, adds

[1] See, *e.g.*, S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III. viii. 1. But for the sense in which S. Thomas Aquinas considered that the Pope is the 'head of the whole Church,' and that others are 'heads' through their relation to Christ, see *ibid.* III. viii. 6.

such passages as that in which he says, 'Whosoever is apart from the Church is joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of the Church; nor will he who leaves the Church of Christ attain to the rewards of Christ. He is foreign, he is impious, he is a foe. He who has not the Church for his mother has not God as his Father. If any one could survive who was outside the ark of Noah, then does he escape who is outside the Church.'[1] And it appears to be with similar reference to external unity that S. Augustine wrote, 'Whoever assent to the Holy Scriptures concerning the Head Himself, and yet are not in fellowship with the unity of the Church, are not in the Church; because concerning the body of Christ, which is the Church, they differ from the witness of Christ Himself. . . . Whoever believe indeed that Christ Jesus . . . has come in the flesh, and rose from the dead in the same flesh in which He was born and suffered, and that He is Himself the Son of God, God with God, and One with the Father, and the unchangeable Word of the Father, through whom all things were made, but yet so differ from His body, which is the Church, that their communion is not with the whole wherever it is spread abroad, but is found in some separated part, it is clear that they are not in the Catholic Church.'[2]

Importance of the See of Rome in the Patristic Period.—It must be admitted, also, that during the patristic times great importance and dignity were attached to the See of Rome and even to the office of the Pope.

The See of Rome not a Necessary Centre of Unity.—But, when it is asked whether, either in Holy Scripture or in the writings of the Fathers, the See or the Bishop of Rome is represented as such a centre of unity as that to be externally separated from them is to be outside the Church, the answer which a fair investigation will supply must be in the negative.

The 'Petrine Texts.'—It is customary with the theologians of the Church of Rome to cite three passages in the Gospels, sometimes described as the 'Petrine texts,'

[1] S. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccl.*, 6.
[2] S. Augustine, *De Unit. Eccl.*, 7.

as establishing the claims made for S. Peter, and through him for the Popes. The three passages are the following: 'Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Matt. xvi. 16-19). 'Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as My Father appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not: and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren' (Luke xxii. 28-32). 'Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My lambs. He saith unto him again a second time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Tend My sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed My sheep' (John xxi. 15-17). It has been maintained that the first of these passages shows that the Church is built upon S. Peter and the keys of the Church have been bestowed upon him; that the second describes S. Peter as the guarantee of truth and the support of the apostles; that the third records the gift to S. Peter of jurisdiction over all the people of Christ; that these

special powers, thus belonging to S. Peter by the choice and appointment of our Lord, are the inherited possession of the Bishops of Rome; and that, necessarily bound up with so great a position, the centre of unity is in the See of Rome, so that any who are separated from it are outside the unity of the Church.

The Council of Trent and the Vatican Council on interpreting Holy Scripture in accordance with the Fathers.—It is obvious that, as a mere matter of textual interpretation, a meaning of this kind cannot be attached to these passages. If this is their true sense, there must be something to show it in the historical treatment of the words of our Lord in the Church. And it is to be noticed that the Church of Rome itself lays great stress on such historical treatment. The Confession of Faith approved by the Council of Trent known as the Creed of Pope Pius IV. contains the sentence, 'I also admit Holy Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, nor will I ever take and interpret it otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers';[1] and the Vatican Council explained this statement of Trent, 'Since those declarations which the holy Council of Trent soundly affirmed about the interpretation of divine Scripture so as to restrain wayward minds are badly explained by certain people, we, re-enacting the same decree, declare its meaning to be that, in matters of faith and morals for the building up of the things which pertain to Christian doctrine, the true sense of Holy Scripture is to be held to be this which Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; and therefore that it is lawful for no one to interpret Holy Scripture contrary to this sense, or likewise, contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'[2] Thus, the Tridentine document asserted that Holy Scripture must not be interpreted

[1] *Bulla Pii IV. super forma jur. prof. fidei.* Cf. Council of Trent, Sess. iv.

[2] Vatican Council, Sess. iii. cap. 2.

'otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers'; and that of the Vatican Council, somewhat lightening the words of Trent under the guise of explaining them, declared that Holy Scripture must not be interpreted 'contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'

The Patristic Interpretations of the 'Petrine Texts.'—In any ordinary sense of the words, the Roman Catholic interpretation of the three 'Petrine texts' is, 'otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' If it falls short of being 'contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers,' it is only because the Fathers did not by any means agree as to the meaning of the texts. Of no one of the three passages is there a continuous and uniform tradition as to the meaning. In the first of the three, there is patristic authority for interpreting the 'rock' to denote our Lord, or the doctrine of His Godhead, or the acknowledgment of His Godhead, or the apostolate of S. Peter, or S. Peter as a symbol of the Church, or S. Peter himself; and the promise of the gift of the keys of the kingdom, the power to bind and loose, is explained, as is natural when the subsequent similar words to the other disciples (Matt. xviii. 1, 18) are taken into account, as applicable to all the apostles.[1] If the 'rock' denotes S. Peter, it still has to be shown that the customary Roman Catholic explanation, either as to S. Peter or as to the Popes, holds good. It is no more possible to separate the words 'upon this rock I will build My Church' from S. Paul's description of the Church as 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets' (Eph. ii. 20) than it is to assign one meaning to the saying of S. Peter, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Matt. xvi. 19), and a different meaning to the saying to 'the disciples' in general, 'What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be

[1] There is a list of explanations with references in the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1897, p. 296. See also Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, pp. 97-109 (third edition).

loosed in heaven' (Matt. xviii. 1, 18). In the face of the multitude of meanings attached to the passage in the Fathers, it is very difficult to suppose that it lays down a doctrine of supreme importance as to the nature of the Church. The Roman Catholic interpretation of the second passage is almost wholly lacking in patristic support.[1] Of the third passage, it may be sufficient to say that the usual explanations in the Fathers interpret it either as a restoration of S. Peter after his fall or as a reference to the position which he had as an apostle, not to some special jurisdiction over the other apostles.[2]

Patristic Testimony in general about the See of Rome.—The absence of patristic support, therefore, for the interpretations customary with Roman Catholics makes it impossible to rest the claims of the Pope on the 'Petrine texts.' It is no less impossible to rest them on patristic testimony in general. That testimony cannot be considered in any detail in a work on the present scale. A presentation of it, presumably as powerful a statement of the case as could be made, appeared in the Encyclical Letter *Satis Cognitum* of Pope Leo XIII. To examine that presentation is to reach results which are to the strongest extent condemnatory of the argument it sought to maintain. For the quotations made by the Pope, when they are regarded in their context and history, are found to give no support to his claims. Only by separating them from their historical setting can they be used as the Pope used them.[3]

Untenable Character of the Claim that Rome is a Necessary Centre of Unity.—It is no exaggeration to say that the claim for the See of Rome as the necessary centre of the unity of the Church is unsupported in Holy Scripture, cannot be based upon patristic testimony, and is contrary to the facts which show that Christians who

[1] See a list of explanations with references in the present writer's *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, p. 317.

[2] See Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-128 (third edition).

[3] The quotations from the Fathers in this Encyclical were examined *seriatim* in the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1897, pp. 297-314. See also the same periodical, April 1894, pp. 27-49; January 1901, pp. 350-369.

were separated from the external communion of the Pope have been universally recognised as Saints of the Church.[1]

Importance of External Unity and Dignity of the See of Rome.—It does not follow from what has been said that external intercommunion is unimportant or that a restored external unity might not well centre in the Bishop of Rome. The precedence of honour possessed by that Bishop in the early centuries of Church history—partly perhaps through association with S. Peter and S. Paul, much more because of the secular greatness of the City of Rome—is an acknowledged fact. When Archbishop Bramhall wrote, 'All the twelve apostles were equal in mission, equal in commission, equal in power, equal in honour, equal in all things, except priority of order, without which no society can well subsist,'[2] he adopted the ordinary position of the great Anglican controversialists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in allowing a 'priority of order' to S. Peter.[3] That the Pope had a precedence of honour and dignity in the primitive Church has been admitted and maintained by so vigorous antagonists of Roman Catholic teaching as Dr. Salmon[4] and the late Dr. Bright.[5] But there is no process of development which is allowed by Catholic theology which can justify such a change of fundamental principle as would be involved in deducing the claim that the Pope is the necessary centre of essential unity out of a priority of order and a precedence of honour.[6] The stress which great teachers of the early Church unquestionably laid on the need of external communion with the whole Church cannot be made a reason for convicting of schism all who are outwardly separated from

[1] On the whole subject, see Puller, *op. cit.* The third edition is greatly enlarged and improved.

[2] Bramhall, *Just Vindication of the Church of England*, chap. v. (*Works*, i. pp. 152, 153 in 'Oxford Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.')

[3] See some useful instances in Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 473-477.

[4] See Salmon, *The Infallibility of the Church*, pp. 367, 368.

[5] See Bright, *Select Sermons of S. Leo the Great on the Incarnation*, pp. 178-180 (second edition); *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 21, 22.

[6] On the limits of development, see Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 424-433.

Rome so long as the Church of Rome allows admission to her visible body only on conditions which those who are faithful to Scriptural and primitive doctrine must in conscience reject.

Conclusion.—It may be said, then, that the essential unity of the Church requires the participation in the one life of Christ, the covenanted means of which are the Sacraments; but does not necessitate that subjective or moral unity of intercommunion and concord which is nevertheless part of the ideal of the Church's life, an ideal approximation to which is ever to be sought by earnest Christians by effort and prayer. That the unity which is organic should supply a motive for the promoting of that which is moral has been well expressed in the English Collect for the feast of S. Simon and S. Jude. 'O Almighty God,' it is there said, 'who hast built Thy Church upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner stone: Grant us so to be joined together in unity of spirit by their doctrine, that we may be made an holy temple acceptable unto Thee.' And a similar line of thought is contained in a prayer which a concurrence of circumstances have made less known than its merits deserve: 'O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord; that, as there is but one body, and one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee.'[1]

[1] Prayer for unity in the Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the day of the accession of the sovereign. This office, which was annexed to the Book of Common Prayer by royal warrant (see Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 645-647), was revised by Convocation in the closing years of the reign of Queen Victoria, and issued in a revised form in 1901.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY LATER THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT: HOLINESS

Objective and Subjective Holiness.—The objective holiness which lies within the aim and system of the Church corresponds to the objective unity which is an essential part of the Church's life; and, as the subjective unity of intercommunion and concord is of the ideal of the Church, so also is the perfection of the subjective holiness of the lives of individual members of the Church.

Obligation of Personal Holiness.—Representative Christian writers have never ceased to set forth the obligation of holy, personal life. The sermons and homilies of the great Fathers are full of denunciations of sin and exhortations to righteousness. In their theological treatises, the importance of personal holiness is rarely far out of sight. It is ever an ideal that the Church in the actual lives of its members may be all fair and undefiled, fulfilling perfectly the prophecy which many saw in the bride depicted in the Canticles (*e.g.* Cant. iv. 7; vi. 9). Even at times when corruption had settled very deeply into many within the Church, the obligation of goodness continued to be maintained in words; and, moreover, bishops, or councils, or individual Christians made serious attempts to put down prevalent wickedness.

Exaggerations springing out of need of Personal Holiness.—From time to time it has been asserted that a religious body is not the Church unless all its members are personally holy. It might have been thought that this contention would have been prevented by the teaching of our Lord and of S. Paul (see pp. 9, 10, 31, 32). On the contrary, it has shown a remarkable power of reappearing, a power probably to be explained by the fact that,

with whatever distortions, it appeals to that which is noble in human thought, the appreciation of goodness. In the fourth century the Donatists, who maintained this position, formed a large and influential sect. In the fourteenth century Wyclif's rejection of the doctrine of a visible Church and identification of the Church with those who shall hereafter attain to heaven carried with them a repudiation of the word holy as applied to the society of the baptized. In the sixteenth century similar ideas formed part of the extraordinary medley of opinions sometimes put together as Anabaptist.

The Visible Society Holy.—On the other hand, the Church has never ceased to use the word holy to describe the visible society. The teaching of a continuous tradition has been maintained in those actions of the Church of England by which in the Creed the visible Church is declared to be holy,[1] and in the twenty-sixth of the Articles of Religion it is said that in this visible Church 'the evil' is 'ever mingled with the good.'

Bishop Alexander Forbes on the Holiness of the Church.—It would be difficult to find a better description of the holiness of the Church than that which was given by Bishop Alexander Forbes. 'As a whole,' he said, 'the Church is holy in that it retains faithfully those means of sanctification which Christ gave her, holy Sacraments, holy laws, holy teaching, so that, amid whatever imperfections, her whole aim is that the tendency of her acts and her teaching shall be to promote holiness and the inward spiritual life. . . . An university is learned, or a city rich, which abounds in learning or riches, although there be many unlearned or poor, and although the learned or rich may yet be short of the ideal of learning or wealth.'[2]

[1] The word 'holy' is used with reference to the Church by the Church of England in the Apostles' Creed at Morning and Evening Prayer and in the Offices of Holy Baptism. It was omitted in the enlarged Nicene Creed in the Order of Holy Communion in the Prayer Book of 1549 and has not been restored in the subsequent English Books. The omission may have been accidental. Against this explanation, see *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1879, pp. 372-383.

[2] Forbes, *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, pp. 278, 279.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY LATER THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT: CATHOLICITY

The Word Catholic.—A prominent aspect of the Church in the New Testament is the universality of its mission. This is one part of what is meant by the 'note' of Catholicity. The word 'Catholic' was used at the beginning of the second century by S. Ignatius to denote the true Church throughout the world in communion with the bishops in contrast to particular bodies of Christians and also to heretical sects which were not in communion with the bishops.[1] In like manner, it was employed by later writers to convey both the idea of universality and the idea of orthodoxy in communion with the bishops.[2] In a well-known passage in the *Catechetical Lectures* of S. Cyril of Jerusalem he draws out what is involved in these two ideas, and says, 'The Church is called Catholic because it extends throughout the whole world from one end of the earth unto the other; and because it teaches universally and completely all the doctrines which ought to come to the knowledge of men, concerning things both visible and invisible, both heavenly and earthly; and because it brings into subjection to godliness the whole race of men, rulers and ruled, learned and unlearned; and because it universally treats and heals every sort of sins which are committed by soul or body, and has in it every form of virtue that is named, in both deeds and words, and in all kinds of spiritual gifts.'[3]

[1] S. Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.*, 8.

[2] See a note in the present writer's *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 307, 308.

[3] S. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.*, xviii. 23.

The Ideal and the Minimum of Catholicity.—The ideal of the Catholicity of the Church thus includes extension throughout the whole world, and among all classes of men, the complete teaching of all the doctrines of the orthodox faith, and completeness also in its dealings with sin and promotion of virtue. It is obvious that the perfect attainment of this ideal at any particular time cannot be of the essence of the Church, since, if it were, the Catholic Church would not now anywhere exist, and the Church of the earliest apostolic age would not have been Catholic. Here, as in the case of unity and in the case of holiness, there is a minimum which the Church, to remain the Church, must not lose, and an ideal approximation to which ought to be its constant aim. Everything which hinders or lessens the capacity of the Church to be universal, everything which deprives it of part of the full truth or inserts in its teaching anything which does not belong to the truth, everything which cramps its power of getting rid of sin and increasing godliness, has a tendency to draw the Church away from the ideal of its Catholic life. To become such that it could not appeal to the whole world or to all classes of men, to deny essential parts of the revealed faith, to become in its accepted principles a necessary instrument of some sins or a necessary opponent of some virtues, would be, in proportion as this was wilful and deliberate and fully carried out, a sinking below the minimum which the 'note' of Catholicity requires. From differing points of view, there are respects in which the Eastern Churches, the Church of Rome, and the English Church have all at certain times come perilously near to loss of Catholicity; through the providence of God each of them has retained at least the minimum, each of them, it may well be hoped, is doing something to strive after the ideal.

CHAPTER IX

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY LATER THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT: APOSTOLICITY

Introductory.—It has already been noticed that the Church described in the New Testament was in union with the apostles (see pp. 18, 19). This union with the apostles involved that the Church had authoritative mission and full sacramental life. Our Lord said to His apostles, 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you' (John xx. 21); the Church included those who in turn had received a commission of an authoritative kind (Acts xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iii. 1-12, iv. 14, v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6; Tit. i. v). The continuance in the 'fellowship' of the apostles required the reception of the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist (Acts ii. 41, 42).

The Historical Teaching of the Church.—The historical teaching of the Church asserts apostolical descent. It sees the means of this link with the apostles through the ages in the ministry in which the bishops occupy the chief places and which they preserve by the ordination of others to various offices. It will be necessary, in treating of the ministry of the Church, to deal with some part of the evidence which concerns the necessity and purpose of episcopacy (see pp. 81-111). It is sufficient now to state the fact that the historical way of regarding the apostolicity of the Church is that contained in a passage in which Tertullian, writing before his lapse into the heresy of Montanism, said, 'If any dare to connect themselves with the apostolic age that they may appear to have descended from the apostles because they are under the rule of the apostles, we can say, Let them then declare the origins of their Churches,

let them unfold the succession of their bishops so coming down from the beginning with continuous steps that the first bishop may have had as his consecrator and predecessor one of the apostles or of apostolic men who remained in the communion of the apostles. For in this way the apostolic Churches bring down their accounts, as the Church of the Smyrnæans goes back to Polycarp, who was appointed by John, and as the Church of the Romans to Clement, who was consecrated by Peter.'[1]

Roman Catholic View of Apostolicity.—It has been maintained by the theologians of the Church of Rome that external communion with the Pope is necessary for the preservation of the 'note' of apostolicity. Rome, it is said, is pre-eminently the apostolic see; and apostolic mission is lost as soon as external separation from Rome is effected. This opinion of the theologians has taken different forms. According to one form of it, now little held, the Pope as the successor of S. Peter is the necessary channel of all episcopal jurisdiction, so that it is through him that the bishops receive their powers. According to the other form, now usually held in the Church of Rome, the mission and jurisdiction of the bishops are inherent in their office and their sees, are received by them from our Lord Himself, and are possessed by them as a matter of divine right; but they have no power to exercise what they have thus received unless they are in external communion with the Pope, since the episcopate is not an independent body apart from the Pope, but is one body with him.

Teaching of S. Leo.—In the first and stronger form, this opinion might derive some support from the teaching of S. Leo the Great, who was Bishop of Rome from A.D. 440 to A.D. 461. S. Leo taught that S. Peter possessed powers which the other apostles did not possess, and was the channel by means of which the divine gifts were communicated to them; and he regarded himself as the successor of S. Peter in such a sense that the specific prerogatives of that apostle had descended to him.[2] It

[1] Tertullian, *De Præsc. Hær.*, 32.
[2] S. Leo, *Serm.* iv. 2, v. 4; *Ep.* x. 1.

is true that S. Leo elsewhere maintains a view, apparently somewhat inconsistent with this position, of S. Peter and S. Paul together as the 'seeds' of the Church of Rome and the 'twin eye' of the body of Christ;[1] and his extant writings do not contain express statements which amount to the modern Roman Catholic teaching on this subject; but it may be allowed that, if S. Leo's assertions about the powers of S. Peter and his own inheriting of those powers are rightly made, it would be difficult to resist conclusions which in one way or another tend to support the claims of the See of Rome. Against the rightfulness of these assertions of S. Leo may be set that they are in conflict with the general teaching of the early Church; that what is recorded about the appointment of S. Matthias and that of S. Paul is not such as we should expect if S. Peter was the channel of all apostolic authority (Acts i. 15-26; Gal. i. 1); and that the records in the Gospels make it clear that the powers of the other apostles were not conferred on them through S. Peter (Matt. x. 1; John xx. 21-23).

The more Moderate Form of the Roman Catholic View untenable.—In the second form in which it is now usually held this opinion of the Roman Catholic theologians is out of harmony with the general teaching of the Fathers about the Church, and the fact that among the recognised saints of the Church are Easterns and Gallicans who in the fourth and fifth centuries were outside the external communion of the See of Rome.[2]

Relation to the Church of Baptized Christians without an Episcopal Ministry.—If, while external communion with the Pope is not a necessary part of the apostolicity of the Church, a ministry episcopally ordained is requisite, it is needful to inquire what is the relation to the Church of those Christians who have received the Sacrament of Holy Baptism but do not belong to a religious body which possesses episcopacy. This question is of practical importance in England because of the large numbers of Nonconformist Christians to whom it refers. With regard to it, the present writer has elsewhere written as

[1] S. Leo, *Serm.* lxxxii. 6, 7.

[2] On both these subjects see Puller, *op. cit.*

follows: 'In one sense they cannot be said to be within the Church because they are separated from the apostolic ministry, while at the same time they have received the Sacrament of Baptism, which joins them to the sacred humanity of Christ and brings them within the Christian operations of the Holy Ghost. All that can be said is that the position of religious bodies which retain Holy Baptism and are without an apostolic ministry is an altogether abnormal one; and that the persons who belong to them have been placed within the Church by their Baptism, but by remaining separate from the apostolic ministry fail to receive the full and proper life of covenanted grace. A schismatic religious body which has retained Christian Baptism "is separate," says S. Augustine, "from the bond of charity and peace, but joined in the one Baptism. And so there is one Church which alone is called Catholic; and whatever of her own she has in communions of others separated from her unity, by virtue of this which she has in them of her own, it is she herself who in fact gives birth, not they." Yet those thus born, he says in many places, need to be reconciled to the Catholic Church, that they may obtain from their real mother in their true home the profit of their sonship.'[1]

Relation of Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity to one another.—The Church, then, is one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic. In each respect there is a minimum below which there cannot be the life of the Church, and there is an ideal towards which it is necessary to strive. In seeking to reach the ideal in any one of them, it is needful to beware of forgetting the others, and thus doing harm to one or more of the rest in an eager desire to promote one particular 'note.' 'The Donatists of the fourth century,' it has been said, 'held to a theory confining membership in the Church to those who conformed to a certain standard of excellence, and they refused all

[1] Quoted from the present writer's *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 121, 122. The passage quoted from S. Augustine is *De Bapt. c. Don.*, i. 14. Among those referred to is *De Bapt. c. Don.*, vii. 103. See also Benson, *Cyprian, his Life, his Times, his Work*, p. 420.

communion with those who thought or acted otherwise. This was the negation of Catholicity. A similar result may follow from any attempt to realise the unity of the Church by unwarranted means. A sect will naturally be united in exact proportion to its narrowness, and a definition of the Church in which expression is specially sought for the note of unity may tend to sectarianism.'[1] Here, as throughout Christian doctrine and practice, it is disastrous to look exclusively at one aspect and ignore all which should be combined with it, to concentrate attention on one particular point, and to forget that this one point cannot be rightly maintained except as it is balanced with and proportionate to those which are akin.

[1] Lacey, *The Elements of Christian Doctrine*, pp. 215, 216.

CHAPTER X

PRIESTHOOD IN NATURAL RELIGION AND IN THE NATION OF ISRAEL

Priesthood in Natural Religion.—The idea and office of priesthood are not confined to revelation. Natural religion supplies numberless instances of priests. Through those instances one general idea runs. It is that the office of the priest is to draw near to the deity, and by means of the relation in which he thus stands to bring other men near also. The particular object may be that of propitiation, or of worship, or of communion. In each case it is the work of the priest to remove some barrier which keeps man away from the deity, or to provide some means of access to Him. In the act of sacrifice the priest is in some sense a mediator, one who brings man to the deity and also the deity to man, one who unites man and the deity and men with men.[1]

The Natural Priesthood in the Old Testament.—In natural religion the office of priest is sometimes connected with headship of a family, or tribe, or nation, and sometimes associated with a special class. In the Old Testament records, the natural priesthood is referred to as having been recognised by God in early days. The sacrifices offered by Noah after his preservation from the Flood (Gen. viii. 20, 21), Abram after he had gone up from Egypt into the south of Canaan (Gen. xiii. 4), Isaac at

[1] There is a very useful chapter on 'Priesthood' in Jevons, *Introduction to the History of Religion*, pp. 270-296; and a valuable collection of facts in Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, a book which should be read with much caution as to suggested inferences. The second edition is greatly improved and enlarged.

Beersheba (Gen. xxvi. 25), Jacob at Bethel (Gen. xxxv.), and Job in the land of Uz (Job. i. 5) appear to have been instances of the exercise of this natural priesthood. With it, too, may be connected the offerings of Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 18) and Jethro (Ex. xviii. 12). Even after the appointment of the specific priestly family, this natural priesthood does not seem to have entirely disappeared. The offering, altar, and sacrifice of Gideon (Jud. vi. 19-21, 24-28), the oblation of Manoah (Jud. xiii. 19), and the office of priest to which Micah 'consecrated one of his sons' (Jud. xvii. 5; contrast xvii. 12, 13) are instances in which some connection appears to have existed between priesthood and a judge, or head of a family, or civil ruler. It is possible that a somewhat similar explanation applies to the sacrifices offered by Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 9, 10, ix. 13);[1] and also to those of David (2 Sam. vi. 13, xxiv. 25; 1 Chron. xxi. 26), Solomon (1 Kings ix. 25; 2 Chron. viii. 12), and Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 12, 13), if it is the case that David and Solomon themselves offered, and not, as is more likely, that they are said to have offered because there were sacrifices by their appointment, and if the action of Ahaz was other than a transgression. On the other hand, the attempt of king Uzziah to offer incense is spoken of in terms of strong condemnation in the Book of the Chronicles, and is assigned as the reason why he was smitten with leprosy by God (2 Chron. xxvi. 16-21).

The Priesthood of the Jewish Nation. — The Jewish nation as a whole had a priestly character. To it God said, 'I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto Myself'; 'If ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me from among all peoples: for all the earth is Mine: and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation' (Ex. xix. 4-6). The assertion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, that 'all the congregation are

[1] Eleazar, the son of Abinadab, whom the men of Kiriath-jearim 'sanctified' 'to keep the ark of the Lord' (1 Sam. vii. 1), may have been a Levite, and his work apparently was to guard and take care of the ark, not to offer sacrifice.

holy' (Num. xvi. 3), and the apparent claim that the priesthood was therefore the portion of all (Num. xvi. 10), appealed to a truth, although the application of it was mistaken. The nearness of access to God to which Israel as a nation was called was declared when it was said, 'What great nation is there that hath a god so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is whensoever we call upon Him?' (Deut. iv. 7). This nearness had the distinctively priestly character of being in some sense mediatorial; for in the divine Providence the nation of Israel was designed to be the instrument of communicating the revelation of God to other nations, and the people in whom, according to the flesh, the Messiah should come.

The Tribe of Levi.—As the Jewish nation was chosen out from other nations to be the priestly people, so within this nation the tribe of Levi was chosen out to be the priestly tribe; and the Levites were solemnly consecrated to this office (Num. iii. 9, 12, 13, viii. 5-22).

The Family of Aaron.—Within the priestly tribe of Levi, the family of Aaron was chosen to fill the priestly office; and the members of the family were set apart by a solemn consecration to be in a peculiar relation to God (Ex. xxix.; Lev. viii.). Among these, again, was the high priest, with a distinctive position above all the rest (Ex. xxix. 5-7; Num. xx. 26-28).

The Office of the Jewish Priests.—The duties of the priestly family were manifold. They included teaching (*e.g.* Deut. xvii. 8, 9), ministration in the sanctuary in the preparation of the shewbread (Lev. xxiv. 5-8), the burning of incense (Ex. xxx. 7-9), the offering of sacrifice (*e.g.* Lev. i. 5), and the blessing of the people (Num. vi. 22-27). Thus there was a twofold relation in their work. They had to give from God to man, when they taught and when they blessed. They had to give from man to God when they offered sacrifice. Their office gave utterance to the underlying idea of all priesthood, that of mediation. The high priest had duties which no one else could perform, the offering of the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement, the taking the blood within the veil, and the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat

in the place of the greatest nearness of God (Ex. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi.).[1]

Representation in Priesthood.—The idea of representation runs through all the different kinds of priesthood. In the natural priesthoods, the father represents his family, the chief represents his tribe, and the ruler or king represents his nation. In the priesthood of special revelation in the Jewish religion, the tribe of Levi is representative of all the tribes for particular services, the family of Aaron is representative of the tribe and the nation for the sacrifices, the high priest is representative of the whole people for the highest offering of all. In these respects, the Levites, or priests, or high priest, represent man before God. In teaching and blessing, they represent God to man.

Restriction in Priesthood.—In the priesthood of revelation, particular works are restricted to particular offices. The sacrifice requires the priest; and the Day of Atonement needs the high priest. In revelation, the natural instinct is taken and used and moulded; new powers are bestowed; and they are allowed within restricted limits. The natural sacrifice is real, and, at some stages in history, is acceptable to God. It becomes inadequate when the distinctive sacrifice of revelation is known and possible.

[1] There is a useful note on 'præ-Christian priesthood' in Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 137-141.

CHAPTER XI

THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST AND THE PRIESTLY CHARACTER OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Introductory.—The priesthood of natural religion and the priesthood of the Old Testament revelation in their different ways lead up to the high priesthood of Christ. The fullest treatment of this subject in the New Testament is contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Characteristics of a high priest.—After speaking of the facts that Christians have 'a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God,' and that He 'hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,' and exhorting his readers to 'draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace' (Heb. iv. 14-16), the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews goes on to explain the characteristic marks of a high priest. In the first place, he says, the high priest must be 'from among men' and 'for men,' so 'that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.' Secondly, the high priest must be able to sympathise with man. He is to be one 'who can bear gently with the ignorant and erring.' And thirdly, the high priest must have received the divine call. 'No man taketh the honour unto himself, but when he is called of God, even as was Aaron' (Heb. v. 1-4). This description of the qualifications of a high priest carries on the ideas contained in the Old Testament of mediation, representation, and restriction. There is restriction because there must be the call of God. There are representation and mediation in his being 'from among men' and 'for men,' and in his offering 'gifts and sacrifices for sins.' The idea of

sympathy is added; but it springs out of the high priest being truly representative.

The Characteristics of a High Priest possessed by Christ.—The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews proceeds to show that our Lord possesses the marks which have been mentioned as characteristic of a high priest. He had received the divine call. 'Christ also glorified not Himself to be made a high priest, but He that spake unto Him,

> Thou art My Son,
> This day have I begotten Thee:

as He saith also in another place,

> Thou art a priest for ever
> After the order of Melchizedek,'

and He was 'named of God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.' By virtue of His perfect manhood He was representative of man and able to sympathise with man. Being at once the Son of God and completely human, He could perfectly fulfil the office of a mediator (Heb. v. 5-10).

The Abiding Priesthood of Christ.—Our Lord is described in Psalm cx. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews as 'a priest for ever' (Ps. cx. 4; Heb. v. 6, etc.). There is a sense in which He was a priest from the first moment of the Incarnation, because all His human life and human acts have a representative and mediatorial character. There was a specific moment of priesthood in His death on the cross which corresponded to the death of the victim in the sacrifices of the Jewish law. The culminating point to which He looked forward through His life on earth and His atoning death was the living presentation of His slain manhood before the Father in heaven, as the culminating point in the Jewish sacrifice was the pouring out or sprinkling of the blood of the slain victim by the priest. Thus in the Epistle to the Hebrews the priesthood of Christ is connected with the propitiation which He accomplished (Heb. ii. 17), with His death (Heb. ix. 26, x. 10, xiii. 12), with His entrance into heaven at His ascension (Heb. vi. 20), and with His abiding work 'on the right hand of the throne of the

Majesty in the heavens' (Heb. viii. 1-3). 'He,' it is said, 'because He abideth for ever, hath His priesthood unchangeable' (Heb. vii. 24).

The Abiding Sacrifice of Christ.—It would be a natural inference from a passage in the Revelation of S. John that, as the priesthood of Christ is abiding, so also is His sacrifice. In his vision S. John 'saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain' (Rev. v. 6). This Lamb is our Lord; for it is recorded that 'the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having each one a harp, and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints,' and that they addressed Him in the words, 'Thou wast slain and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation' (Rev. v. 8, 9). It is natural to interpret this presence in heaven of the 'Lamb standing, as though it had been slain,' to denote an abiding sacrificial action of our Lord whereby He stands, that is, is in the attitude of sacrifice, and wherein His sacrifice is that of His manhood, which has been slain and is alive for evermore. That the inference thus naturally derived from this passage in the Revelation is not unwarranted is clearly shown by the Epistle to the Hebrews. The sacrifice of Christ is there represented as perpetuated in the 'true tabernacle' which is in heaven (Heb. viii. 1-3); 'the heavenly things' are said to be 'cleansed' 'with better sacrifices than' those of the Mosaic law (Heb. ix. 23); and the sacrificial presentation of our Lord's manhood to the Father is referred to in the words, 'Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us: nor yet that He should offer Himself often; as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own; else must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once at the end of the ages hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself' (Heb. ix. 24-26). That is, there is one sacrifice of Christ which lives on in

heaven as He abidingly appears before the Father on our behalf.

The worship of the Church sacrificial.—The New Testament is not without indication that the worship of Christians is of a sacrificial character. S. Paul used language naturally applicable to a priest when he described himself as 'the priest of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, doing the work of a priest in respect of the Gospel of God that the oblation of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost' (Rom. xv. 16). In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the 'altar,' the 'sacrifice of praise,' and the 'sacrifices' of the well-doing and communicating of Christians, are mentioned (Heb. xiii. 10, 15, 16). S. Peter describes the office of Christians as being 'to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ' (1 Pet. ii. 5).[1]

The One Sacrifice of Christ and the Church.—It has been pointed out that the abiding sacrifice offered by our Lord is the living oblation of His manhood, which has passed through death into the new life of the resurrection and the ascension (see pp. 70, 71). He has also empowered the Church to offer this same sacrifice of His slain yet living manhood. Deigning to use the method of the Jewish law in which the partaking of sacred food was closely connected with sacrifice and even of the sacrificial customs of the heathen, He made the Sacrament which He instituted on the night before His death to be a sacrifice. In the words, 'This is My body which is given for you,' 'This cup is the new covenant in My blood, even that which is poured out for you,' 'This do for a memorial of Me' (Luke xxii. 19, 20), He employed sacrificial language and taught that the sacrifice of the Church is the oblation of His body and blood. So also S. Paul says that Christians 'proclaim the Lord's death' (1 Cor. xi. 26) in a context which suggests that there is in the Holy Eucharist a sacrificial presentation to the Father as well as a

[1] See *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1901, p. 345. Cf. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 267-272.

reminder to men. For his use of the word 'memorial' in the two preceding verses (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25) has introduced the idea of sacrifice.[1] 'Holy Scripture teaches,' it has been said, 'that the oblation of the sacrifice of Christ is not limited to heaven, but that it takes place also on earth in the celebration of the Eucharist. The whole account of our Lord's institution of the Eucharist implies the sacrificial character of that rite. Every detail is sacrificial. I notice first that our Lord taught us to use at the Eucharist *bread* and *wine*. It may be admitted that to an ordinary Englishman of the nineteenth century these elements may not suggest sacrificial ideas. But it was surely otherwise with those who were gathered around our Lord in the upper room. The meal-offerings consisted of preparations of fine flour. The drink-offerings consisted of wine. Bread and wine were also largely used in the heathen sacrifices. The very word "immolation" is derived from "mola," the sacrificial meal that was sprinkled on the victims. Thus the bread and the wine, which formed the basis of the Eucharistic rite, were sacrificial things. These sacrificial things our Lord blessed and consecrated; and having consecrated them, He identified them with His own precious body and blood.'[2] In the clear language of a Roman Catholic commentator, 'There is one sacrifice of Christ, the expiation, redemption, and satisfaction for all sins, namely, the sacrifice of the cross; for in it Christ paid a sufficient price for the guilt and desert of all the sins which have ever been committed or shall afterwards be committed. The Mass is a sacrifice not of redemption and satisfaction, but of the application of the redemption and satisfaction accomplished by Christ on the cross; for in the Mass we do not offer a new price for sins, but we apply to ourselves the ancient price and ransom of the cross, as we apply it to ourselves also by means of Baptism, and other Sacraments, and by means of good works. . . . The sacrifice of the Mass

[1] See *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1901, pp. 346, 347.

[2] Puller in *Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice, A Report of a Conference held at Oxford, December* 13 *and* 14 1899, p. 135.

is the same as the sacrifice of the cross, firstly, in representation, as an image is the same as the thing of which it is the image, for the Mass represents the sacrifice of the cross; secondly, in reality, for in the Mass there is the same primary priest offering as on the cross, namely Christ; and in each there is the same victim and sacrifice, namely the body of Christ, the same I mean in fact, although different so far as method is concerned; for in the Mass it is unbloody, while on the cross it was bloody; but that which is unbloody in the Mass signifies and represents that which was bloody on the cross.'[1] So, in the Church there is in the Holy Eucharist the one sacrifice which is the perpetual pleading of the life which our Lord offered in surrender even unto death on the cross, and continually presents to the Father in heaven on our behalf.

The Priestly Character of the Church.—Like the Jewish nation, the whole Christian society possesses a priestly character. 'Ye,' wrote S. Peter, 'are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession' (1 Pet. ii. 9). 'Thou wast slain' are the words addressed to 'the Lamb' by 'the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders,' 'and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests' (Rev. v. 9, 10). In Baptism and in Confirmation Christians in general are anointed to be priests by God the Holy Ghost.

The One Sacrifice the Offering of the Whole Church.—In the Holy Eucharist the consecrated people, the holy nation of the Christian society, offers to God the Father the one sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ which passed through death on the cross and in the tomb, and now lives in heaven. This is the explanation of the plural number that is habitually used in the Liturgy of the Church. The Eastern rites are full of such expressions as 'We offer unto Thee this awful and unbloody sacrifice';[2] and 'We have placed before Thee of Thine

[1] Cornelius a Lapide on Hebrews vii. 27.

[2] Liturgy of S. James: see Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I. 53.

own gifts, and we pray and entreat Thee' 'send out from Thy holy place on high' 'the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit of truth' 'that' 'He may make the bread the body, and the cup the blood of the new covenant of our Lord and God and Saviour and King Jesus Christ.'[1] In the Western Missal still used by the Church of Rome the plural number is no less marked. Among its phrases are, 'We ask and pray that Thou wouldest accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy unspotted sacrifices which we offer unto Thee'; 'We beseech, Lord, that Thou mayest propitiously receive this offering of our service and also of Thy whole family'; 'We, Thy servants, and also Thy holy people,' 'offer unto Thy glorious majesty from Thy own gifts and boons a pure offering, a holy offering, an unspotted offering, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation.'[2] The same phraseology occurs in the Anglican books. The English Book of Common Prayer has the words, 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we humbly beseech Thee'; and 'Our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' The Communion Offices of the Scottish and American Churches contain the phrase, 'We Thy humble servants do celebrate and make' 'the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make.'

A Ministerial Priesthood consistent with the Priestly Character of the Whole Church.—It does not follow that, because the whole Christian society is 'a royal priesthood,' there is no specially appointed priesthood with a specific work.[3] This may be seen from the parallel of the nation of Israel. It was a nation of priests, chosen to be near to God and the exponent of His will. But, within it, by the appointment of God Himself, there was the ministerial priesthood of the family of Aaron selected out of the tribe of Levi. Not otherwise, it will be seen, when the evidence is examined, that there is a ministerial priesthood within the Christian Church.

[1] Liturgy of S. Mark: see Brightman, *op. cit.*, i. 133, 134.
[2] Canon Missæ.
[3] On this subject generally, see Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood.*

CHAPTER XII

THE APOSTLES AND THE CHURCH

The Apostles Representative Disciples.—A large part of the work of our Lord recorded in the Gospels was devoted to training the Twelve. One aspect in which they are to be regarded is that of representative disciples. They were taught by our Lord as the nucleus of the whole Christian body. They received the truths which were to form the Christian inheritance. In them was developed the character which was to mark Christian life.

The Apostles the Recipients of a Divine Commission.—The teaching of the Gospels about the Twelve is not exhausted when they are described as representative disciples. They received from our Lord Himself an authoritative commission for the government and nurture of the Church. Apart from a special position conferred upon them, it would be difficult to understand the marked distinction made between them and the other disciples when it is said that our Lord 'called unto Him His twelve disciples,' or that 'the names of the twelve apostles are these,' or that 'the eleven disciples went away into Galilee' (Matt. x. 1, 2, xxviii. 16), or that 'they that were about Him with the Twelve asked of Him the parables,' or that 'He took again the Twelve, and began to tell them the things that were to happen unto Him' (Mark iv. 10, x. 32), or that 'He called His disciples: and He chose from them twelve,' or that 'He took unto Him the Twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written through the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man' (Luke vi. 13, xviii. 31), or that 'Upon

this many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him. Jesus said therefore unto the Twelve, Would ye also go away? . . . Jesus answered them, Did not I choose you the Twelve, and one of you is a devil? Now He spake of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray Him, being one of the Twelve' (John vi. 66-71). The express mention of the fact that our Lord 'named' the Twelve 'apostles' at the time of their appointment (Luke vi. 13)[1] is another indication that they filled a special position. The use of the word 'apostles' in S. Luke's Gospel (xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10) shows that the suggestion of a distinguished scholar, that 'in its original sense the term apostle was not intended to describe the habitual relation of the Twelve to our Lord during the days of His ministry, but strictly speaking only that mission among the villages, of which the beginning and the end are recorded for us,'[2] cannot be maintained. Our Lord's reference to 'the faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall set over his household,' spoken in answer to the question of S. Peter, 'Speakest Thou this parable' (that is, the parable of the lord returning from the marriage feast) 'unto us, or even unto all?' (Luke xii. 35-48), and the promise to the same apostle, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. xvi. 19), corroborate the inference that the Twelve had a special position which was to lead them to a particular work of caring for and ruling the Church. It is in harmony, again, that the commission for the administration of Baptism was given to the Eleven (Matt. xxviii. 16-20). And although a passage in S. Luke's Gospel (xxiv. 33) shows that others besides the Ten were present when our Lord spoke the words, 'As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you,' 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost' (John xx. 21, 22), as well as when the two disciples returned from Emmaus, the statement, 'Thomas, one of the

[1] This fact is mentioned also in S. Mark iii. 14, according to Westcott and Hort's text.

[2] Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 28. Dr. Hort's argument (p. 26) that the use of the word apostles in the passages referred to is 'anticipatory' cannot be regarded as satisfactory.

Twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came,' and the use of the word 'disciples' in the closing chapters of S. John's Gospel (John xx. 24; cf. xx. 25, 26, 30, xxi. 1), seem to imply that this gift of authority and power was, in some special degree, conveyed to the Eleven.[1] The existence of this special position, moreover, is corroborated by the fact that the Twelve, or the Eleven, were chosen by our Lord to be present at the institution of the Holy Eucharist and to participate in the first administration of this sacred rite (Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 17; Luke xxii. 14). It can hardly be doubted that in this presence and participation they were representatives of the whole Christian body. But, since they were selected for these privileges from other disciples, who, as later events showed, were faithful disciples, there is no more room for doubt that they had a position which the rest of the disciples had not. This conclusion is supported by the words addressed to them by our Lord after the institution of the Eucharist, 'I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as My Father appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Luke xxii. 29, 30). If the Gospels stood by themselves, it would be the natural inference from them that the apostles occupied a special position and possessed a special authority. The antiquity and uniformity of the tradition of the Church would, without anything else, make the truth of this inference almost certain. When the evidence contained in the Acts of the Apostles is added, it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that the apostles were definitely commissioned officers, distinct from, as well as representative of, the whole Christian body. In the Acts the apostles are not only witnesses of our Lord and of His resurrection (Acts i. 8, 22). There was a definite 'office' vacant through the treachery and death of Judas which it was necessary to fill; when Matthias had been chosen and 'numbered with the eleven apostles,' the men of this

[1] See also a valuable note in Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 210 (fourth edition).

inner circle had a position and work of their own; the Twelve possessed the authority to 'appoint' the 'seven men of good report' and to lay hands on them, and to administer the rite of Confirmation to those whom S. Stephen had baptized; throughout the Book they are represented as having from the first possessed authority in the Christian society (Acts i. 20-26, ii. 14, 37, 42, vi. 2-6, viii. 14-17).[1]

The Position of Representative Disciples not inconsistent with that of Recipients of a Divine Commission.—There is no inconsistency in regarding the apostles as both members and leaders of the Christian society. The rulers of any earthly state which is a living nation are representative of the people in general as well as distinct from them. Whatever dignity and powers the Twelve possessed, they could not be apostles unless they were Christians.

The Question whether the Twelve received the Divine Gifts as Disciples or as Apostles.—It has been maintained above (see pp. 76-79) that the Twelve received the commission and gifts for the nurture and ruling of the Church, and especially for the administration of the Holy Eucharist, because of their distinctive position as apostles. The contrary view that the Twelve were addressed by our Lord in all these matters as the representatives of the whole Christian society, and that therefore the commission and gifts were bestowed on the Christian community as a whole, was urged by Dr. Hort.[2] While it is extremely difficult to make sharp divisions between the position of the Twelve as apostles and their status as disciples, it may fairly be said that, for the reasons mentioned above, Dr. Hort by no means made out a good case. But it is of the highest importance to observe that, even if it were true that the authority usually regarded as that of the ministry was bestowed by our Lord on the Christian society as a whole, it would not follow that there ought not to be any ministry in the Church, or that the ministry

[1] See Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 210, 384.
[2] Hort, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 34.

of the Church has no special functions which the other members of the Church cannot exercise without or apart from it. If the authority belongs to the whole body, it has to be ascertained from the history of the body in what way and by what means it can be used. The whole Jewish nation was a priestly society; but the study of the history of the people of Israel shows that the distinctively priestly functions could be exercised by the nation only by means of the ministerial priests who had received specific authority. In the natural sphere, sight and hearing are the faculties and acts of the whole man; but the study of facts shows that these functions can be exercised by the man only by means of eye and ear. Whatever faculties may belong to the Christian society as a whole, and however true it may be that the exercise of these faculties is the act of the community (see pp. 74, 75), the study of the facts of history must declare in what way and by means of what instruments this exercise can take place. And, as will be seen, history makes it plain that the Church has a ministry, that this ministry possesses specific authority, and that there are certain acts which the Church can perform only by means of the organ in the ministry.[1]

[1] See a review of Dr. Hort's *The Christian Ecclesia* in the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1898, pp. 312-330.

CHAPTER XIII

THE MINISTRY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Original Ministry.—In the Church as originally constituted on the Day of Pentecost the apostles comprised the whole ministry.[1] During His life on earth our Lord had chosen and trained them for the office they were to fill and the work they were to do. The fall of Judas had deprived them of one of the appointed number of twelve. It was necessary that the place then vacant should be filled; and after our Lord's ascension, at the instance of S. Peter, two candidates for the office, Joseph called Barsabas, and Matthias, were selected by 'the brethren,' that is the whole company of Christians, being in number about one hundred and twenty, and one of these, Matthias, was chosen by lot, and then 'numbered with the eleven apostles' (Acts i. 15-26). Before His ascension our Lord had commissioned the apostles to baptize, to administer the Eucharist, and to rule the Church, and had given them instructions for the work which they were thus to do (Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25; Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 17, 18; Acts i. 2, 3). Also, on the day of His resurrection, 'He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained' (John xx. 22, 23). Thus, before the Day of Pentecost, the ministry, consisting as yet only of the Eleven and of S. Matthias, was made ready. When, on that Day, God the Holy Ghost

[1] It is here assumed that the seventy disciples sent out by our Lord (Luke x. 1) did not form a permanent part of the ministry. There are useful references for a different view in Gore, *op. cit.*, p, 201, note 2.

descended upon the Christian society and filled it with His indwelling presence, the ministry became able to make effective use of the authority which our Lord Himself had bestowed.

The Ministry in the Acts of the Apostles: Deacons.—The first delegation of any part of the work of the apostles is mentioned in the sixth chapter of the Acts. In consequence of the complaint of the Hellenistic Jews that 'their widows were neglected in the daily ministration,' 'the Twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not fit that we should forsake the Word of God, and serve tables. Look ye out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will continue steadily in prayer, and in the ministry of the Word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch: whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them' (Acts vi. 2-6). In this way the 'seven men of good report' were chosen by the whole Christian society and ordained by the apostles, the specified object of their appointment being that they might manage the relief of the poor. It is not expressly said in the Acts that the office to which these 'seven men' were appointed was the same as the subsequent diaconate of the Church. But the verb (*διακονεῖν*) in the phrase 'serve tables' is that with which the term deacon (*διάκονος*) is connected; and the work done by S. Stephen (Acts vi. 8-10) and S. Philip (Acts viii. 5-13, 26-40) is such as deacons would be likely to perform. And the 'seven men' have been regarded as deacons in the usual tradition of the Church. A phrase used by S. Ignatius, writing at the beginning of the second century, has been thought by some to be based on this identification, though he does not explicitly say that they are the same;[1] S. Irenæus, at the end of the second century

[1] S. Ignatius, *Ad Trall.*, 2. The words are, 'They' (*i.e.* the deacons of his time) 'are not deacons of meats and drinks.'

calls them deacons;[1] and, though there are exceptions to the ordinary tradition in S. Chrysostom in the fifth century,[2] and the Council in Trullo about A.D. 692,[3] it may be concluded, with the best modern writers,[4] that this passage in the Acts records the institution of the diaconate, though it is not impossible that the office of the seven was afterwards divided into the two offices of deacons and the 'presbyters.'[5] S. Philip, one of the seven, is, in one passage in the Acts (xxi. 8), described as an Evangelist, but that term appears to be there used rather as denoting the work which he did, than as a title of an office.

The Ministry in the Acts: Presbyters.[6]—The 'presbyters' (πρεσβύτεροι) are first mentioned in the Acts incidentally and as exercising the office for which the first deacons were appointed. 'The disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa; which also they did, sending it to the presbyters by the hand of Barnabas and Saul' (Acts xi. 29, 30). 'Presbyters' were ordained by S. Paul and S. Barnabas in the Churches of Asia Minor (Acts xiv. 23). At the Council of Jerusalem 'presbyters' are distinguished both from the apostles and from the brethren; and they actually took part, together with the apostles, in the proceedings of the Council (Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; cf. xvi. 4). 'Presbyters' are mentioned in connection with the Church at Ephesus (Acts xx. 17); and were present when S. Paul went in to S. James at Jerusalem on his return from his third missionary journey (Acts xxi. 18). In one passage

[1] S. Irenæus, *C. Hær.*, I. xxvi. 3, and other passages.

[2] S. Chrysostom, *In Act. Ap. Hom.*, xiv. 3.

[3] Council of Constantinople of A.D. 692, canon 16.

[4] See, *e.g.*, Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 188; Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 242. There is an incidental indication in Stubbs, *Ordination Addresses*, p. 2, that the late Bishop of Oxford held that the account in the Acts describes 'the historical origin of the order' of deacons.

[5] See Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles* ('Oxford Commentaries'), pp. lxxxii, 86, for a slightly different view.

[6] Presbyter is the Latin form of the Greek word πρεσβύτερος. In English it is used in the contracted form priest.

in the Acts they are called 'bishops' (ἐπίσκοποι) (Acts xx. 28).

The Ministry in the Acts: Prophets and Teachers.—In four passages in the Acts reference is made to 'prophets,' and in one of these passages the phrase 'prophets and teachers' is used. 'In those days there came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius' (Acts xi. 27, 28). 'There were at Antioch, in the Church that was there, prophets and teachers, Barnabas, and Symeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. And as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away' (Acts xiii. 1-3). 'Judas and Silas, being themselves also prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words' (Acts xv. 32). 'There came down from Judæa a certain prophet, named Agabus. And coming to us, and taking Paul's girdle, he bound his own hands, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles' (Acts xxi. 10, 11). In the first and last of these passages, the work recorded of the 'prophet' Agabus is that of foretelling the future. In the third, the work of the 'prophets' Judas and Silas is to preach. In the second, the 'prophets and teachers' are represented as ministering to the Lord, that is performing some part of divine worship, and are said to have laid hands on Barnabas and Saul, whether as a recognition by the Church of their apostleship, or as blessing them for the particular mission which they were undertaking, is not stated.[1] Thus there is nothing to

[1] For the first interpretation, see Lightfoot, *S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 98; Rackham, *op. cit.*, pp. 192, 193; for the second, see Ramsay, *S. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 64-68.

show whether the 'prophets' and 'teachers' are an order in the ministry, or whether these names, like the term evangelist, are simply descriptive of work done.

The Ministry in the Acts: the Apostles.—The position of the apostles in the Acts has been referred to already (see pp. 78, 79). In their 'teaching and fellowship,' the earliest Christians 'continued steadfastly'; they appointed the first deacons by the laying on of hands; they laid on hands, also, to impart the gift of Confirmation; Barnabas and Saul, who were ranked with the original apostles, appointed 'presbyters'; the apostles, together with the 'presbyters,' considered and decided the questions raised at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts ii. 42, vi. 6, viii. 17, xiv. 23, xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23).

The Ministry in the Acts: Summary.—Thus the ministry, as described in the Acts, comprised the apostles, who confirmed and ordained, and had authority to govern the Church; the 'bishops' or 'presbyters' and the deacons; and those described as 'prophets' and 'teachers.'

The Ministry in the Pauline Epistles in general.—Putting aside for the moment the Pastoral Epistles, the writings of S. Paul show but little about the ministry. What they do show is in harmony with the facts recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. There is a local ministry in the places to which S. Paul's letters are addressed. There are works of 'prophecy,' and 'ministry,' and 'teaching,' and 'exhorting' at Rome (Rom. xii. 6-8); 'apostles,' 'prophets,' 'teachers,' 'workers of miracles,' and possessors of 'gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues' are referred to in the first letter to Corinth (1 Cor. xii. 28-30), as are 'apostles,' 'prophets,' 'evangelists,' 'pastors,' and 'teachers,' in the letter to Ephesus (Eph. iv. 11); at Philippi there are 'bishops and deacons' (Phil. i. 1); at Thessalonica there are those who 'labour among' Christians in general, and 'are over' them 'in the Lord,' and 'admonish' them (1 Thess. v. 12). It is probable that none of these terms, except 'apostles,' 'bishops,' and 'deacons,' denote those who held a definite order. Besides these general

references to the apostolic office, S. Paul mentions as characteristics of an apostle that his mission is direct from Christ (1 Cor. ix. 1; Gal. i. 1); that he has the work of preaching (1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 14, etc.); that he is a ruler of the Church (1 Cor. v. 3-5, xi. 16, 34, etc.); and that he has universal mission (2 Cor. xi. 28).

The Ministry in the Pastoral Epistles.—In the Pastoral Epistles, as in the other writings of S. Paul, reference is made to a local ministry. This local ministry consists of those called by the two names of 'bishops' and 'presbyters,' and of deacons (1 Tim. iii. 1-13, v. 17, 19; Tit. i. 5-9). In addition to it, there are those to whom the letters are addressed, S. Timothy and S. Titus, who are represented as possessing the authority of S. Paul at Ephesus and Crete, who rule, and govern, and ordain in, the local Churches of which they are in charge (*e.g.* 1 Tim. i. 3, ii. 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, v. 19-22; 2 Tim. i. 13, iv. 2; Tit. i. 5, 13, ii. 15, iii. 10, 11), of whom, while no particulars are given as to the ordination of S. Titus, S. Timothy was ordained 'by means of the laying on of the hands of'[1] S. Paul (2 Tim. i. 6), the testimony of the presbyters to the ordination having been borne by their taking part in the laying on of hands[2] (1 Tim. iv. 14).

The Ministry in the Epistle to the Hebrews.—The Epistle to the Hebrews contains little which supplies direct information as to the state of the Christian ministry at the time when the Epistle was written. The writer apparently had some claim to speak with authority; and in three passages he refers to the existence of a ministry among those to whom he writes: 'Remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the Word of God'; 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them: for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account'; 'Greet all that have the rule over you' (Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24).

The Ministry in the Epistle of S. James.—S. James, who

[1] Διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου.
[2] Μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου.

describes himself as 'a bond-servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ' (James i. 1), writes with evident authority. There is possibly a reference to a ministry among those to whom the Epistle is addressed in the exhortation, 'Be not many teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment,' and very definite mention of ministers known as 'presbyters' in the command, 'Is any among you sick? let him call for the presbyters of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the Name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him. Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed' (James iii. 1, v. 14-16).

The Ministry in the Epistles of S. Peter.—S. Peter describes himself as 'an apostle of Jesus Christ,' 'a bond-servant and apostle of Jesus Christ,' and a 'fellow-presbyter' with the 'presbyters' whom he addresses (1 Pet. i. 1, v. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1). In two passages he refers to the work of the ministry as exercised among his readers: 'According as each hath received a gift, ministering it among yourselves, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God; if any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God; if any man ministereth, ministering as of the strength which God supplieth'; 'The presbyters therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the office of bishop, not of constraint, but willingly, according unto God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted unto you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd[1] shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of

[1] With this reference to our Lord as 'the Chief Shepherd' compare the description of Him as 'the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls' (1 Pet. ii. 25); the two passages together, apart from the phrase, 'exercising the office of bishop,' on which

glory that fadeth not away' (1 Pet. iv. 10, 11, v. 1-4).

The Ministry in the Epistles of S. John.—S. John, like S. Peter, calls himself 'the presbyter' in two of his Epistles (2 John 1; 3 John 1). Throughout he writes in a tone of authority. In one passage he appears to refer to a minister who, having some position of authority in the local Church to which Gaius, to whom the Epistle is addressed, belonged, had made a bad use of it: 'I wrote somewhat to the Church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Therefore, if I come, I will bring to remembrance his works which he doeth, prating against us with wicked words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and them that would he forbiddeth, and casteth them out of the Church' (3 John 9, 10).

The Ministry in the Epistle of S. Jude.—The Epistle of S. Jude, who describes himself as 'a bond-servant of Jesus Christ' (Jude 1), has a tone of authority similar to that in the other Epistles. It is possible that the rebuke in the words, 'They went in the way of Cain, and ran riotously in the error of Balaam for hire, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah. These are they who are hidden rocks in your love-feasts when they feast with you, shepherds that without fear feed themselves' (Jude 11, 12), may refer to those who, like Korah in the Old Testament, were in opposition to an appointed ministry among those addressed in the Epistle; but this is not expressed with sufficient clearness to justify any definite inference from the passage.

The Ministry in the Revelation.—In the Book of the Revelation 'the angels of the seven Churches' of Asia Minor are referred to several times (Rev. i. 20, ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 7, 14). In each case, the context requires that the 'angel' be understood to mean an individual Christian in a position of authority in the particular Church. The interpretations by which the 'angel' is

see p. 89, suggest that, as the 'presbyters' were shepherds under the Chief Shepherd, so they were bishops under the Chief Bishop.

explained to denote a guardian angel, or to be a personification of the Church do not satisfy the setting in which the term stands.[1]

'Presbyter' and 'Bishop' different names for the Holders of the same Office in the New Testament.—It has already been mentioned that the same officers have in the New Testament the two titles of 'presbyter' (*πρεσβύτερος*) and 'bishop' (*ἐπίσκοπος*). It may be well to state shortly the evidence on which this conclusion rests: (1) By comparing Acts xx. 17 with xx. 28, and Tit. i. 5 with i. 7, it may be seen that these different names are applied to the same persons; (2) In 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, according to the reading in the received text and the text of the revisers, against the margin of the revisers and the text of Westcott and Hort, the phrase 'exercising the office of bishop' (*ἐπισκοποῦντες*) is used for the work of those who are addressed as 'presbyters'; (3) In Phil. i. 1, and 1 Tim. iii. 1-13 the 'bishops' and the 'deacons' are mentioned side by side without any reference to the 'presbyters'; and in both passages, though especially, perhaps, in the latter, it is very unlikely that the 'presbyters' would not have been mentioned if they were different from the 'bishops'.[2]

The Ministry in the New Testament: Summary.—To put together, then, the evidence about the ministry derived from the different parts of the New Testament, the existence of the following ministers may be observed: (1) the apostles; (2) delegates of the apostles, of whom S. Timothy and S. Titus are instances, acting in particular places with apostolic authority; (3) those called 'presbyters' or 'bishops' forming part of the local ministry, ordained by the apostles or the delegates of the apostles;

[1] A contrary opinion to that expressed above has, however, been advocated by Bishop Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians*, pp. 199, 200, and Bishop Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 232, 233. Against their view, see Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 442, 443.

[2] See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-99. The 'bishops' have been distinguished from the 'presbyters' by, among others, Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, ii. 326-331 (English translation). On the origin of the titles, see Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 363-373.

(4) deacons, also forming part of the local ministry, and also ordained by the apostles or the delegates of the apostles; (5) the 'prophets' and 'teachers,' possibly the holders of an office to be compared with that of the delegates of the apostles, such as S. Timothy and S. Titus, but possibly also not distinguished as holding a distinct office but named 'prophets' and 'teachers' from an aspect of their work. The New Testament shows also a rite of ordination consisting of the laying on of hands.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MINISTRY IN HISTORY LATER THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Ministry in the East: The Church at Jerusalem.—The history of the Church at Jerusalem supplies the first instance of a bishop in the usual modern sense; that is, one not only possessed of episcopal authority, but also a localised ruler, governing a definite sphere marked out as his diocese. That S. James was such a bishop there can be no doubt. Of a position of this kind held by him there are some indications in the New Testament itself. Three passages in the Acts of the Apostles and one passage in the Epistle to the Galatians suggest that, though S. James was not the first among the apostles generally, he took precedence among them at Jerusalem. When S. Peter was released from prison, he made special mention of him in a message to the Christian community (Acts xii. 17). He appears to have held the chief place at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 13, 19).[1] He presided when the Church at Jerusalem received S. Paul shortly before the imprisonment of the latter (Acts xxi. 18). He is mentioned by S. Paul in connection with affairs at Jerusalem, contrary to the usual order, before S. Peter as well as before S. John (Gal. ii. 9). The evidence from the writers of the Church outside the New Testament, which goes back to as early a time as the middle of the second century, shows that he has been universally regarded as local or diocesan bishop of Jerusalem. On the death of S. James, Symeon succeeded

[1] The reasons for which this is denied in Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 79-81, are not convincing. See it affirmed in Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 197; Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

him in a like position; and from him a continuous series of local or diocesan bishops of Jerusalem can be traced.[1]

The Ministry in the East; the Church in Asia Minor.—There is abundant evidence from the second and third centuries that local or diocesan or monarchical episcopacy was established in Asia Minor by the apostles. 'Here,' wrote Bishop Lightfoot, 'we find the widest and most unequivocal traces of episcopacy at an early date.'[2] The most important parts of it are in the statements made by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, writing in Egypt and Africa early in the third century; S. Irenæus, writing near the end of the second century in Gaul, whither he had gone from Asia; and S. Ignatius, writing in Asia Minor at the beginning of the second century.[3] The testimony of S. Ignatius is of special importance because of his early date. S. Ignatius himself was Bishop of Antioch, having been appointed to that office about A.D. 69. Forty years later, he was charged with some offence, tried at Antioch, and condemned to the death of being given to wild beasts at Rome. On his way to Rome in the custody of soldiers, he journeyed through Asia Minor. As he went, he received messages from the Asiatic Churches, and wrote letters to them in reply. Of these letters, seven have come down to our time.[4] In them S. Ignatius refers repeatedly to the ministry of the Church. It is significant that the possibility of a true Christian Church without a ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, or without an episcopal rule, which is that of a single bishop governing a diocese, does not appear to have entered his mind. He closely links with the central truths of the Godhead and Man-

[1] See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 208, 209; Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-253. The opinion expressed by Dr. M'Giffert, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, i. 176 (note on Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv. 5), that 'tradition' made the 'presbyters' who ruled after 'the form of the Jewish Sanhedrim' into 'successive monarchical bishops,' is against the evidence.

[2] Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

[3] See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-214; Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-277.

[4] The genuineness of the seven letters has been established by Bishop Lightfoot in his *Apostolic Fathers*, II. i. 70-414.

hood of Christ teaching that by means of the Eucharist there is union with Christ, so that a purpose of the ministry of the Church is to unite Christians with our Lord. Thus, the bishop is, in his eyes, not simply the centre of unity in discipline and prayer, not simply the representative of God, but also necessary to the Church as supplying the condition through which the sacramental life of union with God may be secured. 'It is therefore meet for you,' he says, 'in every way to glorify Jesus Christ who glorified you; that being perfectly joined together in one submission, submitting yourselves to your bishop and presbytery, ye may be sanctified in all things.' 'Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, even as the bishops that are settled in the furthest parts of the earth are in the mind of Jesus Christ.' 'Your honourable presbytery, which is worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop, even as its strings to a lyre.' 'If any one be not within the precinct of the altar, he lacketh the bread of God.' 'Every one whom the Master of the household sendeth to be steward over His own house, we ought so to receive as Him that sent him. Plainly, therefore, we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself.' 'Assemble yourselves together in common, every one of you severally, man by man, in grace, in one faith and one Jesus Christ, who after the flesh was of the race of David, who is Son of man and Son of God, to the end that ye may obey the bishop and the presbytery without distraction of mind; breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ.' 'Be ye zealous to do all things in godly concord, the bishop presiding after the likeness of God and the presbyters after the likeness of the council of the apostles, with the deacons also who are most dear to me, having been intrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ, who was with the Father before the worlds and appeared at the end of time.' 'Let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of apostles. Apart

from these there is not even the name of a Church.' 'He that doeth aught without the bishop and the presbytery and deacons, this man is not clean in his conscience.' 'As many as are of God and of Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop.' 'Be ye careful therefore to observe one Eucharist (for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union in His blood; there is one altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow-servants), that, whatsoever ye do, ye may do it after God.' 'Let no man be deceived. Even the heavenly beings and the glory of the angels and the rulers visible and invisible, if they believe not in the blood of Christ [who is God], judgment awaiteth them also. "He that receiveth let him receive." Let not office puff up any man; for faith and love are all in all, and nothing is preferred before them. But mark ye those who hold strange doctrine touching the grace of Jesus Christ which came to us, how that they are contrary to the mind of God. They have no care for love, none for the widow, none for the orphan, none for the afflicted, none for the prisoner, none for the hungry or thirsty. They abstain from Eucharist and prayer, because they allow not that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised up.' 'Shun divisions, as the beginning of evils. Do ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the apostles; and to the deacons pay respect, as to God's commandment. Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop. Let that be held a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it. Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be, even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church. It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve, this is well-pleasing also to God; that everything which ye do may be sure and valid.'[1] These are some of the passages which make it

[1] S. Ignatius, *Ad Eph.*, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 20; *Ad Magn.*, 6; *Ad Trall.*, 3, 7; *Ad Philad.*, 3, 4; *Ad Smyrn.*, 6, 8.

clear that S. Ignatius regarded the threefold ministry of bishop, priest, and deacon as a divinely appointed part of the organisation of the Church of God.

The Ministry in the East: the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.'—A manuscript written at Jerusalem in A.D. 1056, containing the book entitled *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, was discovered at Constantinople by Philotheos Bryennios, the Patriarch of Nicomedia; and this book was published by him in 1883. Opinions as to its date have varied widely from about A.D. 60 to about A.D. 160; the tendency among scholars of late years has been towards a date in the earlier part of this period. 'We can with very great security,' writes Bishop Gore, 'date the *Didache* within the first century.'[1] The place where it was written is uncertain; it is usually assigned to either Egypt or Syria.[2] It is a practical manual of a very incomplete and fragmentary kind,[3] possibly based upon a pre-Christian Jewish book.[4] Four chapters of this little treatise deal with the officers of the Church. Those mentioned are 'apostles,' 'teachers,' 'prophets,' 'bishops,' and 'deacons.' It is directed that the 'apostles' are to be received as the Lord, and that they are not to remain more than two days in one place. The 'prophets' and 'teachers' were apparently not necessarily localised in any particular place, though it appears that the 'prophet,' as distinct from the apostle, had the right to settle in a Church which he visited. The 'bishops' and 'deacons' are said to be elected by the people and 'to minister the ministry (λειτουργοῦσι τὴν λειτουργίαν) of the prophets and teachers,' and it is directed that they are 'those that are honoured with the prophets and teachers.'[5] The evidence supplied by this book, whatever it may be worth, points to a

[1] Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

[2] For a valuable discussion on this book, see Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 374-382.

[3] See a paper read by Bishop Lightfoot at the Church Congress of 1884, reprinted, with additions, in the *Expositor*, January 1885.

[4] See Salmon in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv. 814, 815.

[5] *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, 11, 12, 13, 15.

settled ministry of 'bishops' (this word, as in the New Testament, denoting the order of 'presbyters') and 'deacons' chosen by the people, like the first deacons in the Acts of the Apostles, and possibly, like them, though of this nothing is said, ordained by the laying on of hands by the higher order; and to 'apostles,' 'prophets,' and 'teachers,' who may possibly have been apostolic delegates in some matters resembling S. Timothy and S. Titus.

The Ministry in the East: in the first two Centuries: Summary.—Summing up, then, the testimony from the East for the first two centuries, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* seems to represent a state of the ministry bearing some resemblance to that indicated by the Acts of the Apostles but without the apostles themselves, while the rest of the evidence agrees that 'the chief authority of government, ministry, and ordination passed from the apostles and those who ranked with them to the bishops of the period of Ignatius without ever having belonged to the presbyters.'[1]

The Ministry in the West: S. Clement of Rome.—The Epistle of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthian Church was probably written in A.D. 95 or 96.[2] The place of S. Clement in the succession of the Roman bishops is differently given in the different lists. Tertullian represents him as the successor of S. Peter. In the Liberian list, which was drawn up in A.D. 354, the order, as it is at present in existing copies, is S. Peter, Linus, Clement. According to S. Irenæus and many others the order after S. Peter is Linus, Cletus, Clement. There is little doubt that the right order is that given by S. Irenæus; and there is some possibility that the same order was in the original text of the Liberian list.[3] In the Epistle of Clement, which is written, not in his own name, but in the name of the Church at Rome, the ministry is regarded as a governing body which possesses authority and has special functions in worship, the powers

[1] Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

[2] See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, I. i. 22, 23, 26, 27, 58, 346-358, ii. 7, 8.

[3] See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, I. i. 67, 68, 201-345.

of which are derived from the apostles by succession. Reference is made to 'deacons' and 'presbyters' and 'bishops,' and to those called 'distinguished men' or 'rulers.' Of these titles, it is obvious that 'deacon' is used in its ordinary sense, and that the 'presbyters' and 'bishops' are identical, as in the New Testament; the 'rulers' or 'distinguished men' are most probably equivalent to the apostolic delegates in the New Testament. Thus, the Epistle of S. Clement shows at Corinth a ministry greatly resembling that at Ephesus or Crete in the time of S. Paul; and the position of S. Clement himself, by whatever name he may have been called, was that of a bishop bearing rule at Rome.[1]

The Ministry in the West: S. Polycarp.—S. Polycarp, who died about A.D. 155, had in his youth listened to the teaching of S. John, and had been appointed Bishop of Smyrna by, as Tertullian says,[2] S. John, according to S. Irenæus,[3] the apostles. His *Epistle to the Philippians*[4] was written in reply to a request from the Church of Philippi for any letters of S. Ignatius which he might possess. In his letter he does not mention as existing at Philippi any orders of the ministry other than 'presbyters' and 'deacons.' But the inference, drawn at one time from this fact by so eminent a scholar as Bishop Lightfoot, that 'episcopacy did not exist at all among the Philippians at this time, or existed only in an elementary form, so that the bishop was a mere president of the presbyteral council,'[5] can hardly be maintained in view of the fact that S. Ignatius, who must have known the state of Church affairs at Philippi, regarded episcopacy as universal and necessary (see p. 92); and the later 'supposition' of the same great writer, 'either that there was a vacancy in the Philippian bishopric at this time, or, as seems more probable, that the ecclesiastical organisation there was not yet fully developed,'[6]

[1] See Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 280-295.
[2] Tertullian, *De Præsc. Hær.*, 32.
[3] S. Irenæus, *C. Hær.*, III. iii. 4.
[4] For the evidence that this letter is genuine, see Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, II. i. 562-587.
[5] Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 215.
[6] *Idem.*, *Apostolic Fathers*, I. i. 578.

is little more satisfactory. It is far more probable that, as Bishop Gore suggests, the silence of the letter as to the existence of a bishop, in the sense of S. Ignatius and of modern usage, at Philippi is simply due to 'no representative' of the 'superior order in the Church' being 'yet localised in the Church at Philippi.'[1]

The Ministry in the West: the 'Shepherd' of Hermas.—The book entitled the *Shepherd* was probably written in the middle of the second century by Hermas the brother of Pius, the Bishop of Rome.[2] The references which it contains to the ministry show the existence of 'apostles' and 'teachers' of a past generation; 'presbyters' who appear to have governed the Church; 'deacons' who assisted the 'presbyters' in financial matters; 'rulers' who are probably to be identified with the 'rulers' or 'distinguished men' of the Epistle of S. Clement; and 'bishops' whose office, except that they showed hospitality and cared for the desolate and the widows,[3] is undefined. If it were possible to identify the 'rulers' with the 'presbyters,' it would appear that the 'presbyters,' in the time of this treatise, were the chief authorities in the Church known to the writer. As, however, he distinguishes them, it is probable that his book presents similar facts to those in the Epistle of S. Clement, namely, that above the 'presbyters' there were 'rulers' corresponding to S. Timothy at Ephesus and S. Titus at Crete.[4]

The Ministry in the West in the first two Centuries: Summary.—There appear to be two theories which, with some degree of plausibility, may be based upon the evidence as to the ministry in the West in the sub-apostolic period. (1) It has been maintained that there was at Rome, and possibly elsewhere in the West, a college of 'presbyter-bishops' who had all received the full authority of the episcopate. These would, therefore, be without superiors, and would hand on their own

[1] Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

[2] See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, I. i. 4, 359, 360. But see Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 214, 215.

Hermas, *Shepherd*, *Vis.*, ix. 27.

See Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 300-303.

ministry. At later ordinations only one of the number received the full episcopal authority, the rest receiving only the reduced authority of the 'presbyters'; and the one who received the full episcopal authority became the local or diocesan or monarchical bishop.[1] Such a theory satisfies most of the evidence well; and it derives some support from the later practice of the Church at Alexandria and the teaching in which the writer known as Ambrosiaster and S. Jerome exalt the office of 'presbyter.'[2] It is, however, an objection of weight against it that it requires the identification of the 'rulers' or 'distinguished men' mentioned by S. Clement of Rome and Hermas with the 'presbyters,' whereas both writers appear to distinguish them. (2) The other view is that the 'presbyters,' whatever local authority they may have possessed, were never the supreme authority, but that over them were men of apostolic authority who were not at first localised, the 'rulers' or 'men of distinction' of S. Clement and Hermas, possibly identical with the 'prophets' and 'teachers' of the New Testament and the East, who occupied much the same position as S. Timothy and S. Titus, who ordained to the ministry, and who, in some matters, exercised the chief authority. These were gradually localised; and the title of 'bishops,' which had originally denoted the 'presbyters,' came to be confined to them. At first sight, this view appears to satisfy some parts of the evidence less fully than that previously mentioned; and it does not fall in so well with the teaching of Ambrosiaster and S. Jerome and the later practice of the Church at Alexandria. There is, however, nothing in the evidence inconsistent with it: it allows for the distinction drawn by S. Clement and Hermas between the 'presbyters' and the 'rulers' or 'distinguished men'; and it most easily accounts for the settled position of the local or diocesan or monarchical bishops at the end of the second century, and for the tradition that such bishops had always been in the Church.[3] Theologically, the difference between these

[1] See Langen, *Geschichte der Römischen Kirche*, i. 95, 96. See also Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, II. i. 376, note 1.

[2] See Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-348.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 304, 305.

two theories is not of importance. According to either of them the episcopal authority always existed; the existence of it depended on succession from the apostles; and episcopal ordination is necessary to a valid ministry. Whatever historical or other interest there may be in any discussion of them, theologically it is a small matter whether at any particular time the episcopal authority was given to a number of individuals besides the one who, in the later organisation, would alone perform episcopal acts, or whether the later restriction was always maintained.[1] Consequently, it may, on either theory, be regarded as clear that, whatever the obscurity of some details, the constitution of the Church in the West in the first two centuries was in principle the same as in the East.

The Ministry in Later Times.—From the end of the second century the threefold ministry of bishop, priest, and deacon is uniformly found as part of the settled constitution of the Church. There is common teaching that distinctively Christian gifts are communicated in the society having this ministry derived by episcopal succession from the apostles. If it is the case, as S. Jerome in one passage states, that 'at Alexandria the presbyters used always to appoint as bishop one chosen out of their number and placed on the higher grade, as if an army should make a general or deacons should choose one of themselves whom they knew to be diligent and call him archdeacon';[2] and if S. Jerome's meaning is that the newly appointed bishop did not undergo any ceremony of consecration by a bishop, the probability is that at Alexandria there was a custom by which all the 'presbyters' were in the position of 'presbyter-bishops' who had received the full episcopal powers at their ordination as 'presbyters'.[3] Isolated instances of ordination by others than bishops which have been

[1] Cf. Gore, *The Mission of the Church*, pp. 29-32.

[2] S. Jerome, *Ep.*, cxlvi.

[3] See Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, pp. 122-130, 325-330 (fourth edition). Some recently acquired evidence on the custom at Alexandria is given and discussed in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1901, pp. 612, 613; January 1902, pp. 278-282.

alleged as recognised in the early Church will not bear examination.[1] Neither can the opinion, sometimes put forward, that the abbots of Iona, though only 'presbyters,' exercised the power of ordaining, as well as considerable powers of jurisdiction, be maintained. When it is said by the Venerable Bede that the abbot and monks of Iona 'ordained' S. Aidan before he set out on his mission to Northumbria,[2] there are sufficient reasons for understanding the word 'ordained' in the sense of 'caused to be ordained'.[3] 'They caused him,' says Mr. William Hunt, 'to be consecrated bishop'; 'it is quite certain,' adds the same authority, 'that Aidan received bishop's orders from one or more bishops, for Bede acknowledges his episcopal rank.'[4] The fact that none of the few supposed exceptions in historical Christianity to the rule of episcopal ordination which have been brought forward will bear to be investigated affords significant indication of the universality of the rule. In East and West alike the Church of history has required that the ministry be episcopally ordained. Even S. Jerome, in the very passage in which he is exalting the dignity of the 'presbyters,' and in which he refers, as mentioned above, to the practice of the Church at Alexandria, says: 'What, with the exception of ordaining, does a bishop do which a presbyter does not?'[5] showing plainly that he regarded ordination as an episcopal act. While there may be doubts as to the particular way in which the different functions were distributed at some times and in some places, it is very clear that, so far as the essential powers of the orders are concerned, it is true that, in the words of the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal, 'from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons.'

The Appointment of Bishops.—According to the tradition

[1] See Gore, *op. cit.*, pp. 340-343. [2] Bede, *H.E.*, iii. 5.
[3] See Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History*, pp. 154-157 (third edition).
[4] Hunt, *The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 77.
[5] S. Jerome, *Ep.*, cxlvi.

of the Church, the whole Christian society has part in the appointment of its bishops. It is the office of the clergy to make the election, of the laity to assent to that which the clergy do, of the bishops of the province, with their metropolitan, to ratify the election and finally to consecrate the new bishop. This right method of procedure has met with continual interference. The laity have seized the initiative and made the election which pertains to the clergy; or the laity have ceased to maintain their lawful right; or some portion of the clergy has usurped that which belongs to the clergy in general; or a sovereign has by his nomination declared who the bishop was to be.[1] It cannot be said that, at the present time, the appointment of bishops is anywhere theoretically satisfactory either in the East or in the West.[2] The method in the Church of England of the sovereign issuing a *congé d'élire* to the chapter of the diocese and sending with it the name of the person nominated is, perhaps, less objectionable in practice than it is in theory; and it may be anticipated that, in the event of a really bad nomination, the Chapter concerned would have the courage to reject the nominee of the crown.

Apostolic Sees, Metropolitans, Patriarchs.—In the early Church, all bishops were regarded as inherently equal. 'The episcopate,' wrote S. Cyprian, 'is one, a share of which is held by each of the bishops in such a way that they have a joint tenure of the whole.'[3] But in connection with this must be remembered the dignity assigned to the 'apostolic sees,' or sees founded by apostles, which included those of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus, Alexandria, and Smyrna, and the special position of the patriarchs and metropolitans.[4] In the first three centuries the leading sees were reckoned to be those of

[1] See a clear statement by Mr. W. H. Frere in the *Guardian*, January 20, 1897, p. 106. See also Mr. Rackham's Essay in *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, pp. 46-49, 68-75.

[2] Obvious instances are in Russia and France.

[3] S. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccl.*, 5.

[4] See Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-11. Cf. the articles 'Metropolitan' and 'Patriarch' in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. At the Council of Constantinople of A.D. 381 the See of Constantinople was put in the second place above Antioch and Alexandria because of the civil greatness to which it had by this time attained as 'new Rome.'[1]

The Bishop of Rome.—When S. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans (about A.D. 57), it is evident that there was a considerable colony of Christians at Rome (Rom. i. 7, 8, xvi.). The origin of this Christian society is unknown. It is not likely that S. Peter had previously preached there (see Rom. i. 11, 12, xv. 20, 21). About A.D. 61 S. Paul visited Rome, and about A.D. 68 S. Peter and S. Paul were martyred there. The general tradition of the Church ascribed the foundation of Christianity at Rome to the work of S. Peter and S. Paul. At the first, the Church at Rome was a Greek colony in a Latin city. By a history which cannot be traced, the language and customs became Latin, the transitionary period probably being late in the second century. The See of Rome had a precedence of honour partly because of the secular greatness of the city, and partly because of the association with S. Peter and S. Paul, Rome being the only apostolic see in the West (cf. pp. 49-54). Reference was made to it by S. Irenæus at the end of the second century as a convenient central illustration of the succession and teaching of the whole Church; and he stated as the reason that 'to this Church, on account of its more influential pre-eminence, it is necessary that every Church should resort, that is the faithful, who are from all quarters; and in this Church the tradition, which comes from the apostles, has ever been preserved by those who are from all quarters.'[2] That this passage does not imply that the Church at Rome was in itself a guarantee of truth is shown by the phrase that the apostolic tradition is preserved in it 'by those who are from all quarters,' and by the fact that S. Irenæus goes on to appeal to the witness of the apostolic Church of Smyrna and the apostolic Church of Ephesus as co-

[1] Council of Constantinople of A.D. 381, canon 3.
[2] S. Irenæus, *C. Hær.*, III. iii. 1, 2.

ordinate to that borne at Rome.[1] This precedence of honour made it natural that the See of Rome should sometimes initiate action and sometimes declare the results of the action of the Church in general; and that recourse should be had to it in difficulty. Its influence was largely increased by the continuous orthodoxy of its teaching, especially during the Arian controversy, in which, apart from the lapse of Liberius, who was Pope from A.D. 352 to A.D. 366, Rome remained steadily Catholic. The removal of the seat of the Western Empire to Milan and Ravenna in A.D. 404 tended to increase the dignity of the Bishops of Rome. But, as yet, no right on the part of the Bishop of Rome to dictate to other Churches in matters of doctrine or discipline, nor any specially defining power of this see, nor any specific need of external communion with it, was acknowledged. The rule of S. Leo the Great did much to advance the power of the Pope (see pp. 61, 62). After his time, the continual doctrinal disputes in the East, which increased the influence of a see which steadily held the truth, the centralisation of Catholics in consequence of the heresy of the barbarians who overran the West, and the great wealth of the Roman Church, all tended towards an increased regard for the opinion of the Pope, an increase in the practice of appealing to Rome, and an increase also in the practice of looking for the decrees of councils to be confirmed by the Pope. The papacy of Gregory I. (A.D. 590-604) did much to extend the power of the See and Bishop of Rome, by reason of the general unsettlement of Europe and the width of the Pope's interests and the enterprise and strength of his rule. The heresy of Pope Honorius I. (A.D. 625-638), and the weakness in secular affairs of Pope Martin I. (A.D. 649-653), did something to diminish the influence of their see. But the growth of it soon went on again. Factions and heretical leanings had made Alexandria and Antioch of little importance by the end of the sixth century. The Mohammedan

[1] S. Irenæus, *C. Hær.*, III. iii. 3, 4. Cf. Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-35.

conquests at the end of the seventh century destroyed North African Christianity, which, as being of an independent and courageous type, had been a powerful restraint on any undue development of Rome. Throughout the eighth century the power of the Papacy grew. The Bishops of Constantinople were becoming mere tools of the Emperor. Of the five great Sees of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, Rome alone remained as a real spiritual power. The coronation of Charles the Great as 'Emperor of the Romans,' with his rule over a large part of Europe, by Pope Leo III. (A.D. 800) may perhaps have led to an enlarged view in common thought of the greatness of the Pope who could give such rights to the Emperor. In the ninth century the practical effect of the Forged Decretals, whether forged in the interests of the Pope or of the bishops, was to increase the power of the Papacy. The growing severance from the East tended to leave Rome without any check. The iniquitous Popes of the tenth and eleventh centuries did not destroy the institution which they disgraced. The last half of the eleventh century saw a succession of reforming Popes who were good men, and aimed at the good of the Church; the masterly rule of Pope Gregory VII. (A.D. 1073-1085), with his ideals of the sway of the earthly representative of Christ in every department of life; and the quiet consolidation of Gregory's work after his death. More and more appeals were made to Rome; and Rome was the one power which could redress the wrongs, whether civil or ecclesiastical, which were inflicted by powerful kings. In the time of Innocent III. (A.D. 1198-1216), the vigorous foreign policy of the Pope, the Crusades, the work of the Dominicans and Franciscans, and the Lateran Council of A.D. 1215, all increased the papal power. Pope Boniface VIII. (A.D. 1294-1303) claimed absolute and parallel authority in all matters secular and spiritual by virtue of the two swords which he said were the rightful possession of the successors of S. Peter. Through the greed and extortion which marked the Popes of the fourteenth century, and the scandalous immorality of those in the fifteenth

and sixteenth centuries, the spiritual claims of the Papacy continued to be upheld; and the idea of papal infallibility, already suggested by Leo III. (A.D. 795-816) and Gregory VII. (A.D. 1073-1085) gradually became more common. The supreme jurisdiction of the See of Rome, never acknowledged in the East, gradually conceded throughout the West, was repudiated by the Church of England in the sixteenth century. That external communion with the Pope is not necessary either to the reception or to the due use of episcopal authority has already been shown (see pp. 61, 62).

Minor Orders.—By, at any rate, the middle of the third century, besides the bishop, priest, and deacon, the orders of sub-deacon, acolyte, exorcist, reader, and doorkeeper had come to be recognised. The office of reader is mentioned first in Tertullian, writing in Africa about A.D. 199, and then in a letter of Cornelius, who was Bishop of Rome from A.D. 251 to A.D. 252, in a letter of S. Cyprian, who was Bishop of Carthage from A.D. 248 to A.D. 258, and in the *Testament of the Lord*, a Syrian or Cilician document which may date from the middle of the third century. The sub-deacon, acolyte, exorcist, and doorkeeper are mentioned first in a letter of Pope Cornelius, the first three of these being referred to also by S. Cyprian, and the first in the *Testament of the Lord*.[1] In modern times there has been a slight difference between the Eastern and the Roman Catholic writers as to the status of the sub-deacon. The Easterns limit the sacred orders to bishop, priest, and deacon, and consider all the others to be minor orders; Roman Catholic theologians, though differing among themselves whether the office of sub-deacon is sacramental, agree that the sacred orders comprise the offices of bishop, priest, deacon, and sub-deacon, reckoning the episcopate and the priesthood as one order. In the Church of England no one of the orders below that of deacon has been retained.

Deaconesses.—In writing to the Romans, S. Paul makes

[1] Tertullian, *De Præsc. Hær.*, 12; Cornelius in Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 43; S. Cyprian, *e.g. Ep.*, xxix. xxxiv. 4, lxix. 15; *Testamentum Domini*, i. 23, 33, 44, 45.

mention of Phœbe a 'deaconess of the Church that is at Cenchreæ' (Rom. xvi. 1);[1] and in his first letter to S. Timothy, lays down regulations for the choice of women holding some such office (1 Tim. iii. 11).[2] In the early Church, deaconesses held a recognised place in the East, where they were formally set apart for their office, and performed various ministrations for women in Church and at home; and there are a few instances of them in the West. By the end of the twelfth century in the West, and perhaps a century later in the East, they had ceased to exist.[3]

The Sixteenth Century.—One of the results of the controversies and struggles of the sixteenth century, was that many Christians lost the episcopal ministry of the historical Church. Among some of those bodies who are thus without bishops, careful ordinations by presbyters, supposed to be valid, have been kept up; in other cases very little regard for ordination real or supposed survived. At the present time the Protestant Nonconformists in England and Wales, the presbyterian and other non-episcopal bodies in Scotland and Ireland, and various foreign Protestants, are without a ministry which includes bishops. Such ministries, while those who use them in good faith may well receive much spiritual blessing, cannot be said to possess the pledge of sacramental life, which is afforded by the historical episcopate. On the other hand, an episcopal ministry has been retained by the Churches of the East, the Church of Rome, and the Church of England.

[1] But Dr. Hort in *The Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 207, 208, does not think that the word διάκονος is here used in its technical sense.

[2] The grammatical construction shows that 'their wives' (A.V.) cannot be a right translation; and the context shows that the reference is to some special class of women, not women in general (R.V.). The passage in 1 Tim. v. 3-16 does not refer to deaconesses but to women on the list of the Church to receive relief.

[3] On the history of the office of deaconess, see Robinson, *The Ministry of Deaconesses*; and an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1899, pp. 302-340, entitled 'On the Early History and Modern Revival of Deaconesses.'

Anglican Orders.—In the Church of England, the intention that the 'orders of ministers' which 'from the apostles' time there have been' 'in Christ's Church' should 'be continued, and reverently used and esteemed,' has been positively asserted;[1] and care has been taken to preserve the essential features of ordination and to prevent the ministrations of any who had not received 'episcopal consecration or ordination.'[2] In spite of this, the validity of Anglican orders has been frequently questioned or denied by Roman Catholic theologians, and they have been declared wholly invalid by a Bull of Pope Leo XIII. There are no good grounds for doubting the facts of the consecration of Archbishop Parker to whom the subsequent succession is due, and of Bishop Barlow who was the principal consecrator of Parker. The objections made to the English offices because they do not provide for the 'delivery of the instruments,' that is, of the paten and chalice, to one being ordained priest, and do not specify the sacrificing power of the priesthood, might be made equally well against all the ordinals of the Church for many centuries. The intention of the Church of England, not to create a new ministry, but to continue the historical ministry of Christ's Church, is expressly stated in the Preface to the Ordinal (see above). The argument that the consecrating bishop must himself intend to make a sacrificing ministry is not in accordance even with Roman Catholic theology. In the Bull of Pope Leo XIII. all the objections which have been raised against Anglican Orders except those based on the alleged insufficiency of the office, and the lack of intention on the part of the Church of England were dropped; and to these two, as indicated above, a wholly sufficient answer may be made.[3]

[1] Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.

[2] *Ibid.* Humanly speaking, the retention of bishops in the Church of England may have been due partly to alarm at Antinomian ideas and a sense that episcopacy supplied security which might, without it, be lacking, and partly to a conviction that it formed part of the divinely appointed order of the Church.

[3] For further details see a brief statement in the present

The Administration of Sacraments.—While Baptism administered by a deacon or a layman or a woman is valid, the proper minister is either a bishop or a priest. Confirmation was sometimes administered in the early Church by priests, probably (though of this there is no proof) using oil which a bishop had blessed. In the modern East it is administered by priests with oil blessed by a bishop. In the West the administration of it is confined to bishops. The celebration of the Holy Eucharist has always been confined to bishops and priests,[1] as has also been the giving of Absolution. The oil for the last unction must be blessed by either a bishop or a priest. Ordination requires a bishop as minister. It is probable that, as taught in most western theology, the ministers in Matrimony are the persons contracting it, not that, as taught in the East, the minister is a bishop or priest. The recognition in the West of the validity of marriages contracted without the presence and blessing of a priest or bishop is in harmony with this, although it is highly desirable that such blessing should always be obtained by members of the Church; and a decree of the Council of Trent declares marriages contracted without the presence of a priest and two witnesses to be invalid in those countries in which the decrees of the Council are published.

Pastoral Work other than the Administration of the Sacraments.—The pastoral duties of the clergy comprise much more than the administration of the Sacraments. Early in the second century S. Polycarp wrote, 'The presbyters also must be compassionate, merciful towards all men, turning back the sheep that are gone astray, visiting all the infirm, not neglecting a widow or an orphan or a poor man.'[2] This conception of priestly work has always been preserved in the office books of the Church. The distinctive character of the Christian priest results from the gift by which he has been

writer's *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 209-211, and a very full treatment in the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1896, pp. 281-303, April 1896, pp. 24-51, January 1897, pp. 365-400.

[1] See the present writer's *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, p. 176.

[2] S. Polycarp, *Ad Phil.*, 6.

empowered to offer the Christian sacrifice. But it would be a very imperfect description of his work to limit it to the performance of functions connected with the Sacraments.[1] The 'corollaries of spirit and life' which are involved in 'leadership in Eucharistic worship'[2] have received emphatic utterance in the Roman Pontifical and in the Ordinal of the Church of England. Both alike explicitly refer to the ministering of the Sacraments and the forgiveness of sins;[3] but they contain much else. In the Roman office for the ordination of a priest, the bishop is directed to pray, 'O God, the author of all sanctification, of whom is the true consecration and the fulness of blessing, do Thou, O Lord, pour upon these Thy servants, whom we dedicate to the office of presbyters, the gift of Thy blessing; that, taught by the instruction given to Titus and Timothy by Paul, they may approve themselves elders by the weight of their deeds and the pattern of their life; that, meditating in Thy law day and night, they may believe what they read, and teach what they believe, and follow what they teach; that they may show forth in themselves and establish by their example and ratify by their counsel justice, perseverance, pity, fortitude, and all other virtues; that they may preserve in unspotted purity the gift of their ministry; that, for the service of Thy people, with stainless blessing they may transform the bread and wine into the body and blood of

[1] See Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 294-297.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

[3] In the Roman rite, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses both for the living and for the dead'; 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou shalt have remitted, they are remitted to them; and whose thou shalt have retained, they have been retained.' In the Anglican rite, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments.' 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in the congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.'

Thy Son; and that, filled with purity of conscience and true faith and the Holy Ghost, they may, on the day of the righteous and eternal judgment of God, rise again with unbroken love unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ.' In the Anglican Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests the bishop is directed to say to those who are presented to him, 'We exhort you, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you have in remembrance, into how high a dignity, and to how weighty an office and charge ye are called: that is to say, to be messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord; to teach, and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever.' And, if the Eastern rites of ordination are in some respects less splendid than those of the West, that for the laying on of hands to make a presbyter contains prayer not only that the newly ordained may stand at the altar and offer sacrifice and baptize, but also that he may declare the gospel of the kingdom and minister the word of truth.

CHAPTER XV

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH AS SHOWN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Introductory.—At the time of the Incarnation the idea of a number of men possessing authority as rulers and teachers was familiar to the Jews. To the great lawgiver Moses, and the elders who shared in the work of rule, and the prophets who declared the will of God, there had succeeded the Sanhedrim and the scribes. When our Lord appointed His apostles to govern (Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18) and to teach (Matt. xxviii. 20) there would be nothing strange in such functions being connected with a religious work.

The Exercise of Authority in the Acts of the Apostles.—In the Book of the Acts the twofold exercise of authority, to govern and to teach, by the apostles is prominent. Their chief, S. Peter, points out the need of a new apostle in the room of Judas (Acts i. 15-22). They bear witness to our Lord and to the facts of His earthly life (Acts, *e.g.* i. 8, 22, ii. 32, iv. 33). They declare the conditions upon which entrance into the Church is to be obtained (Acts ii. 38, xvi. 31, 33). They determine on the institution of the first deacons and appoint them to this office by the laying on of hands (Acts vi. 2-6). While the apostles in these matters act as leaders and as possessed of specific authority, they are not isolated from the rest of the Church. The brethren in general select the two from whom S. Matthias is chosen by lot to be numbered with the Eleven (Acts i. 15, 23-26). The multitude of the disciples choose the first deacons and set them before the apostles for their formal appointment and ordination (Acts vi. 2, 5, 6). When a serious question affecting the status of the Gentiles and the whole future history of the Church has to be decided,

a council is held, of which the members are the apostles and presbyters (Acts xv. 2, 6, 23, R.V.), at which discussion takes place in the presence of the laity (Acts xv. 12), the decisions of which, while the work of the apostles and presbyters, are assented to by the laity also (Acts xv. 22, 23, R.V.).

The Exercise of Authority in the Epistles.—The attitude of the writers of the Epistles is obviously authoritative. S. Paul gives definite teaching and distinct commands. He declares, for instance, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is an essential part of the Christian faith (1 Cor. xv.). He orders the excommunication of a vicious man and forbids association with Christians who commit certain sins (1 Cor. v.; cf. 1 Tim. i. 20). In the Pastoral Epistles he lays down what kinds of persons are to be selected as ministers, and gives directions as to the rule of the Church. Indeed, in the Epistles the authority of the apostle is less fully shown to be exercised in union with the rest of the Church than it is in the Acts. Even if the instructions about the choice of ministers in the Pastoral Epistles are intended to be communicated to the laity by the apostolic delegate who receives them, the action of the laity in the selection of the ministers has not the prominence given to it in the account of the appointment of the first deacons. Yet the association of the Church in general with the authority of the apostle is not altogether out of sight. S. Paul refers to the action of the presbyters (1 Tim. iv. 14) at the ordination of S. Timothy as well as to his own (2 Tim. i. 6). In his insistence on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, he refers to the reception of the gospel by the Corinthians as well as to the preaching of it by himself (1 Cor. xv. 1). The excommunication which he orders is to be executed by the whole Christian body (1 Cor. v. 4); the punishment in it is said to have been 'inflicted by the many' (2 Cor. ii. 6); and the subsequent forgiveness is described as that of the Church, ratified by the apostle (2 Cor. ii. 10). In connection with his own act of judgment, he appeals to that exercised also by the Corinthian Church, 'Do not ye judge them that are within?' (1 Cor. v. 12); and

in deciding a point of discipline refers to the 'custom' of 'the Churches of God' (1 Cor. xi. 16). Thus, while in the Epistles the action of the Christian body in general is less emphasised than in the Acts, it is to some extent recognised.

Divine Sanction claimed for the Authority of the Church in the New Testament.—At the beginning of the Book of the Acts the apostles are described as those whom our Lord had chosen and whom He taught 'concerning the kingdom of God' (Acts i. 2, 3). It was in the power derived from the outpouring of the Holy Ghost that S. Peter first asserted the claims of Christ to the men of Judæa and dwellers in Jerusalem (Acts ii. 4, 14-36). S. Paul declared that his apostleship was 'not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father'; that his Gospel was not 'after man,' but received by him 'through revelation of Jesus Christ' (Gal. i. 1, 11, 12); that His authority was given by the Lord (2 Cor. x. 8); and that what he did in the way of discipline he did 'in the person of Christ' (2 Cor. ii. 10). The Council of Jerusalem said of its decrees, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us' (Acts xv. 28). The Church was described by S. Paul as 'the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. iii. 15). All this was harmonious with the promises of our Lord: 'Upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it' (Matt. xvi. 18); 'If he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican' (Matt. xviii. 17);[1] 'I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth' (John xiv. 16); 'The Comforter, even the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you' (John xiv. 26); 'When He, the Spirit of truth is come, He shall guide you into all the truth' (John xvi. 13).

[1] It is probable that our Lord here refers to the Christian Church because of the previous reference in Matt. xvi. 18, and because in the verses which immediately follow our Lord speaks of the authority which He commits to His apostles. Against this interpretation, however, see Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 9, 10.

CHAPTER XVI

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH IN HISTORY LATER THAN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Rule of the Bishop.—The authority of the bishop to instruct and govern his diocese is closely connected with his position as essential to the ministry of the Church. The Epistles of S. Ignatius, as has been seen (see p. 93), lay stress on the need of episcopacy in the interests of the discipline of the Church. S. Irenæus, giving utterance to a belief found throughout the history of the Church, makes the episcopal succession a guarantee for the truth of the creed which by means of the bishops has been handed down from the apostles, and is found in the teaching of the Universal Church. But in neither writer is the bishop viewed in isolation. S. Ignatius links with him the presbyters and deacons, and is mindful of 'a power of action in union with the bishop'[1] on the part of the whole Christian body. S. Irenæus assumes that the teaching of the individual bishop will be maintained and held in check by Holy Scripture, the tradition from the apostles, and the common belief of the whole Church.[2] From the primitive point of view, the authority of the bishop as a teacher and as a ruler is great. It is, nevertheless, restrained by his relation to his own diocese, and especially the priests in it,[3] and to the whole Church in the present and in the past.

[1] Rackham, Essay on 'The Position of the Laity in the Early Church' in *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, p. 41. See S. Ignatius, *Ad Eph.*, 1, 3, 9, 12, 13, 21; *Ad Magn.*, 2, 13, 14; *Ad Trall.*, 1, 6, 7, 11, 13; *Ad Philad.*, 2, 4, 10; *Ad Smyrn.*, 4, 10, 11.

[2] See S. Irenæus, *C. Hær.*, I. ix. 3—x. 1., IV. xxvi. 2, xxxiii. 7.

[3] See Wood, *The Regal Power of the Church*, pp. 68, 69.

Œcumenical Councils.—The most complete exercise of the authority of the Church is in an Œcumenical Council. An Œcumenical Council differs from a merely General Council because while a merely General Council is in its constitution representative of the whole Church, it may fail to give utterance to the real and permanent mind of the whole Church, whereas an Œcumenical Council is one, the decisions of which have been universally and permanently accepted within the Church. The Œcumenical Councils are seven in number. They were held at Nicæa in A.D. 325, Constantinople in A.D. 381, Ephesus in A.D. 431, Chalcedon in A.D. 451, Constantinople in A.D. 553 and in A.D. 680-681, and at Nicæa in A.D. 787. That an Œcumenical Council derives its authority from the subsequent acceptance, which shows that it has rightly expressed the mind of the whole Church, may be most clearly illustrated by the Council of Constantinople of A.D. 381, which was summoned from the East only, and at which no Western bishop was present.

The Œcumenical Councils summoned by the Emperors.—It is a matter of history that the Œcumenical Councils were summoned by the Emperors, the First Council of Nicæa by Constantine the Great, the Council of Constantinople of A.D. 381 by Theodosius I., the Council of Ephesus by Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., the Council of Chalcedon by Marcian and Valentinian III., the Council of Constantinople of A.D. 553 by Justinian, the Council of Constantinople of A.D. 680-681 by Constantine IV., and the Second Council of Nicæa by Constantine VI. and the Empress Irene.

The Presidents of the Œcumenical Councils.—The presidents of the Œcumenical Councils were as follows: Of the First Council, Hosius, Bishop of Cordova; of the Second Council, Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, Gregory of Nazianzus, Bishop of Constantinople, and Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, in succession; of the Third Council, S. Cyril of Alexandria; of the Fourth Council, in part the legates of the Pope, and in part the imperial commissioners, and, at one session, the Emperor himself; of the Fifth Council, Eutychius, Bishop of Constantinople; of the Sixth Council, in part the legates of the Pope, and

in part the Emperor; and of the Seventh Council, the legates of the Pope.

The Members of the Œcumenical Councils.—The members of the Œcumenical Councils were the bishops, together with those priests and deacons who were the representatives of absent bishops. Other priests and deacons who were for any reason present were not, in these Councils, members of the Councils, and had no vote.

Acceptance of the Œcumenical Councils.—Each of the Œcumenical Councils was subsequently accepted by the Church at large.[1] Each of them, moreover, was ratified by the Emperor; and, with the exception of the Second, and the canons of the Fourth, by the Pope.[2]

Matters dealt with by the Œcumenical Councils.—Matters both of doctrine and of discipline were considered at the Œcumenical Councils. Thus their work embraced subjects of the most different kinds. The First Council declared the deity of the Son of God, and dealt with the attitude of prayer on Sundays and in Eastertide.

Authority of the Decisions of the Œcumenical Councils.—The decisions of the Œcumenical Councils on matters of faith are permanently binding on the whole Church; for a council is not Œcumenical unless its teaching is the expression of the true mind of the whole body. It is impossible to suppose that doctrines declared to be obligatory as conditions of communion in decrees made to be its own by the Church at large should be changed. The rightfulness of such decrees is implied in the promises of our Lord. For instance, the truths declared to be of faith in the Nicene Creed are not subject to alteration by the Church. It is obvious, also, that some decisions in matters of discipline are not of permanent weight. The regulation of the Council of Nicæa, by which kneeling is prohibited on Sundays and throughout Eastertide, is not completely observed anywhere in the

[1] On the acceptance of the Second Council of Nicæa, see a paper read by Mr. W. J. Birkbeck at the Church Congress of 1895, reported in the *Guardian* of October 16, 1895; and an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1896, pp. 448-476.

[2] Pope Vigilius at first dissented from the Fifth Council, but afterwards accepted it.

West at the present time. Many matters of discipline are closely connected with doctrine or with life; alterations in them must always be serious; in some there is reason for doubt whether any change can be rightly made by a part of the Church in what the whole Church has done.[1]

Councils other than Œcumenical.—Councils other than Œcumenical include merely General Councils, and those that are provincial or diocesan. A merely General Council is one that is representative of the whole Church, but fails to obtain acceptance from the whole Church. A council fully representative may give utterance to what, as subsequently universally accepted, is the mind of the Universal Church, so that its decisions have that certainty which is based upon our Lord's promise to the whole Church, and the council itself become an Œcumenical Council; or it may fail to do this and illustrate the truth of the statement in the twenty-first English Article of Religion that 'General Councils' 'may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God.'[2] A General Council, like an Œcumenical Council, consists of bishops, or bishops and priests and deacons representing bishops. A provincial Council consists of the bishops of the province, or of some of them and the authorised representatives of the others. A diocesan Council consists of the bishop and priests, or the bishop and priests and deacons of the diocese.

The Relation of the Laity to Councils.—Attention has already been called to the position of the laity in the primitive Church (see pp. 112, 113). Since the judgment of the Church by which a council becomes Œcumenical is that of the whole society, they had their share in this subsequent ratification of the acts of a council. In the councils of the third century the laity had their

[1] For fuller details about the Œcumenical Councils and for references to authorities, see an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1901, pp. 298-324.

[2] The instances of merely General Councils erring which are most usually given, are those of the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, taken together, in A.D. 359, and the Council of Ephesus of A.D. 449.

regular place. At the beginning of the fourth century they ceased to be represented. The presence and influence of the Emperors and their representatives were rather those of the chief power in the State than of the Christian laity, as may be illustrated by the fact that when the Emperor Constantine took a prominent part at the Council of Nicæa, he had not yet been baptized. On the other hand, the presence of sovereigns and nobles at Western Councils of the sixth and following centuries appears to have been due to their position as Christian laity as well as that of authority in the State. There were laymen at Western Councils in the sixth and seventh centuries, notably at the Second Council of Orange, in A.D. 529.[1] In modern times, the laity have ceased to possess in this form the influence in the Church which was formerly theirs. In the Church of England, the Houses of Parliament are no longer assemblies of Churchmen. The Houses of Laymen have little direct influence with the Houses of the Convocations of the clergy. In the Church of Rome, the laity have even less recognised position, in spite of provisions for their presence at synods in some official documents.[2] In the Churches of the East, also, the direct influence of the laity has similarly disappeared.[3]

The Common Teaching of Theologians.—The decrees of the Œcumenical Councils contain the whole truth which members of the Church must accept if they are to remain in communion with the Church. But the voice of the Church is also made known by teaching uniformly given by divines, sufficiently universal and permanent to be, in the absence of protest, allowed by the Church. The rejection of such teaching, as distinct from the rejection

[1] On this whole subject, see the Essay, by Mr. Rackham, in *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, which, however, in some places exaggerates the position of the laity in the early Church. Cf. Bright, *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life*, pp. 51-99. See also Benson, *Cyprian, his Life, his Times, his Work*, pp. 426-431.

[2] See Hefele, *History of the Councils*, i. 24, 25 (English translation).

[3] On the Christian idea of the layman, see Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 91-98.

of doctrine which an Œcumenical Council has imposed as obligatory, does not necessitate either the excommunication of those by whom the rejection is made or their voluntary abstention from communion. It may, however, be said that those who have accepted the general principle of the authority of the Universal Church will recognise a claim on their belief in a traditional doctrine which is both universal and permanent, even if it has not been affirmed by a conciliar decree imposing excommunication on those who reject it. The reason for this claim is that the lasting acquiescence on the part of the Church in any teaching universally prevalent is a practical allowance of the truth of the doctrines so taught and a consequent acceptance of them.

The Teaching of individual Bishops and Priests.—The authority of any individual in the Church depends on his action, whether in the way of instruction or in the way of discipline, being in harmony with the teaching and practice of the whole body. Yet, until appeal has been made against it, the authority of an individual bishop or priest is of weight for those to whom it applies. The parish priest is the authorised teacher and ruler in matters of religion of those who have been committed to his care. The bishop is similarly authorised to teach and rule his diocese. From the judgment of a parish priest, an appeal is open to the bishop of the diocese. From the bishop of the diocese, on whom it lies to consult the priests who form with himself the diocesan Council, there may be an appeal to the bishops of the province; and from them, again, to those of a wider sphere, or of the Universal Church. Nowhere is the individual, as an individual, of ultimate authority. His authority depends on his faithfully reporting the teaching, or faithfully applying the discipline, of the Universal Church, and on his teaching and discipline being maintained by it.

The Background of Holy Scripture.—Since Holy Scripture is the revelation of God's truth and will, all the teaching of the Church must be based upon it. It is the office of the Church to repeat, to co-ordinate, to interpret, the teaching contained in the Bible. The

moral and disciplinary law, like the dogmatic system, is derived from Holy Scripture. The traditional legislation of the Church is marked by the sense that there is a revealed religion to be guarded and maintained. 'To collect the mind of the Scriptures'[1] is the striking phrase by which S. Athanasius describes the work of the First Œcumenical Council. On examining the proceedings of the Œcumenical Councils in general, or the ordinary teaching of the divines of the Church, it will be found that Holy Scripture is always represented as the necessary basis.

The Background of Tradition.—The Church in Council, or by means of theologians, explains the faith which has been once revealed. The mind of the Church is no less living and active than the mind of an individual. As time goes on, the unchanging truth is seen in new lights, and, if it is to be of practical value, must be expressed in new ways. To be really the Church's voice, this new treatment must be able to justify itself by the tradition from the apostles. The essential realities of a faith which has been once revealed do not change. Even the Church of Rome, with all its insistence on the force of its own living voice, has declared that a tradition, to be authoritative, must have been 'dictated either by word of mouth by Christ or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by a continual succession in the Catholic Church.'[2]

The Pope not infallible.—It is the doctrine of the Church of Rome that the *ex cathedra* decisions of the Pope in matters of faith and morals are infallible. This doctrine depends upon the Roman view of the unity and catholicity and apostolicity of the Church which has been already shown to be without weight (see pp. 44-64). It was based also by the Vatican Council of A.D. 1870[3] on the three 'Petrine texts,' the Roman Catholic interpretation of which cannot be maintained (see pp. 49-53). Further, the Bishop of Rome was not regarded in the early Church as an infallible teacher and ruler; and it

[1] S. Athanasius, *De Decr. Nic. Syn.*, 20.
[2] Council of Trent, Sess. iv.
[3] Vatican Council, Sess. iv. cap. i., iv.

has even been the case that a Pope, in teaching difficult to regard as other than *ex cathedra*, has fallen into heresy and been condemned by Councils and later Popes.[1]

The Church of England.—The Church of England has the authority of a local and national Church. Its teaching, so far as it is the reproduction and reutterance of what has been universally taught, has the authority of the Universal Church. In other matters, there is the tentative element which always belongs to anything which is of a part or for a time. Anything which a local and national Church has done is of higher authority than that which is of an individual priest or bishop or diocese. Like their actions, it is subject to the revision of the whole. Every distinctive utterance and action of the Church of England can only await the judgment of the whole Church, if in the Providence of God the reunion of Christendom should be brought to pass.[2]

Conclusion.—The authority of the Church is necessarily weakened by division. The power of grasping and realising truth largely depends on the interaction of mind on mind, and so of one part of the Church upon another. The power of discipline is impaired by being in some respects weakened and in other respects rendered arbitrary when one part of the Church is divided from others. For the restoration of a true teaching voice and a true discipline, Christians must look to a recovered external unity corresponding to the inner sacramental union in the divinely communicated life. 'As God's Holy Spirit fills the river of God, it will, in all its several channels, overflow its banks, until they meet in one vast sea of the knowledge and of the love of God.'[3]

[1] See the present writer's *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 140-145.

[2] See *ibid.*, pp. 146-148.

[3] Forbes, *A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, p. 291.

INDEX

ABSOLUTION, 109.
Ambrosiaster, 99.
Anglican Orders, 108.
Apostolic Sees, 102, 103.
Apostolicity, 35, 60-64.
Apostles, 35, 52, 60, 62, 76-82, 85, 86, 91, 92, 112, 114.
Appointment of Bishops, 101, 102.
Athanasius, S., 121.
Augustine, S., 37, 43, 44, 45, 49, 63.

BAPTISM, 1, 2, 9, 15, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 32, 33, 37, 41, 42, 43, 45, 60, 62, 63, 74, 81, 109.
Bede, the Venerable, 101.
Benson, Archbishop, 63, 119.
Bethlehem, Council of, 39, 40.
Birkbeck, W. J., 117.
Bishops, 91-111, 115, 117, 118.
Blackmore, R. W., 40, 45, 46.
Boniface VIII., 105.
Bramhall, Archbishop, 54.
Bright, Dr., 38, 54, 101, 119.
Brightman, F. E., 74, 75.
Butler, Bishop, 16.

CALVIN, J., 43.
Catholicity, 34, 35, 58, 59, 63, 64.
Charles the Great, 105.
Chrysostom, S., 83.
Church, Dean, 3, 16.
Church Quarterly Review, 52, 53, 57, 72, 73, 80, 107, 109, 117, 118.
Clement of Alexandria, 92.
Clement of Rome, S., 96, 97, 98, 99.
Confirmation, 18, 27, 41, 42, 74, 79, 85, 109.
Cornelius, Pope, 106.
Cornelius a Lapide, 73, 74.
Cyprian, S., 43, 44, 48, 49, 102, 106.
Cyril of Jerusalem, S., 58.

DEACONESSES, 106, 107.
Deacons, 82, 83, 85, 86, 90, 92-111, 112, 115, 117, 118.
Development, 54.
Donatism, 37, 44, 57, 63, 64.

ECK, H. V. S., 44.
Eucharist, 15, 18, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 37, 41, 42, 45, 60, 72-75, 78, 81, 93, 94, 110.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 92, 106.

FORBES, BISHOP, 57, 122.
Frazer, J. G., 65.
Frere, W. H., 55, 102.

GIBSON, DR., 38, 39.
Gore, Bishop, 15, 43, 78, 79, 81, 83, 89, 91, 92, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101.
Greek Church, 39, 40, 111.
Gregory I., 104.
Gregory VII., 105, 106.

HEFELE, BISHOP, 119.
Hellenistic Jews, 19.
Hermas, 98, 99.
Hilary of Poitiers, S., 45.
Holiness, 33, 56, 57, 63, 64.
Honorius I., 104.
Hooper, Bishop, 38.
Hort, Dr., 14, 77, 79, 80, 91, 107 114.
Hunt, W., 101.
Hus, J., 38.

IGNATIUS, S., 58, 92-95, 115.
Innocent III., 105.
Irenæus, S., 83, 92, 97, 103, 104, 115.

JEROME, S., 99, 100, 101.
Jerusalem, Council of, 21, 22, 114.

Jevons, F. B., 65.
John the Baptist, S., 1, 2, 5.
Journal of Theological Studies, 100.

KIDD, B. J., 38, 39.
Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven, 1-17, 23, 24.

LACEY, T. A., 63, 64.
Laity, 102, 112-114, 118, 119.
Langen, Dr., 99.
Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), 42, 105.
Leo I., 61, 62, 104.
Leo III., 105, 106.
Leo XIII., 45, 47, 53, 108.
Liberius, Pope, 104.
Liddon, Dr., 3, 16.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 83, 84, 89, 91, 92, 95, 96, 98, 99.
Luther, M., 43.

M'GIFFERT, DR., 92.
Martin I., 104.
Matrimony, 109.
Metropolitans, 102, 103.
Minor Orders, 106.
Moberly, Dr., 72, 75, 98, 110, 119.
Montanism, 60.

ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS, 116-118.
'Oxford Church Text-Books,' 38, 39.
'Oxford Library of Practical Theology,' 9, 18, 26, 41, 42, 43, 44.

PATRIARCHS, 102, 103.
Pius IV., 51.
Polycarp, S., 97, 98, 109.
Pontifical, Roman, 110.
Presbyters, 83-89, 92-111, 113, 115, 117, 118, 120.
Priesthood, 65-75.
Psalms of Solomon, 3, 4.
Puller, F. W., 52, 53, 54, 62, 89, 102, 104.
Pusey, Dr., 26.

RACKHAM, R. B., 83, 102, 115, 119.
Ramsay, Dr., 84.
Robertson, Dr. A., 5.
Robinson, C., 107.
Rome, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47-55, 61, 62, 75, 96, 97, 102-106, 121.
Russian Church, 40, 45, 46, 111.

SACRIFICE, 65-75.
Salmon, Dr., 54, 95.
Sanday, Dr., 12.
Stone, D., 9, 18, 26, 41, 42, 43, 53, 58, 63, 109, 122.
Stubbs, Bishop, 83.

TARGUMS, 4, 5.
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 95, 96.
Tertullian, 60, 92, 97, 106.
Testament of the Lord, 106.
Thomas Aquinas, S., 38, 45, 48.
Trent, Council of, 51, 52, 109, 121.

UNITY, 32, 33, 44-55, 63, 64.

VATICAN COUNCIL, 51, 52, 121.
Vigilius, Pope, 117.
Visible Society, The Church a, 15, 17-19, 24, 25, 31, 37-43.

WESTCOTT, BISHOP, 68.
Weizsäcker, C. von, 89.
Wood, E. G., 115.
Wyclif, J., 38, 57.

NOV 13 '30

STONE, Darwell 702
The church: its ministry S877ch
and authority. 1908